

to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

2563. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the county of Los Angeles, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to Chinese, and urging amendment of the Immigration Act of 1924; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

## SENATE

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 28, 1943

(Legislative day of Wednesday, September 15, 1943)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, with our burdened lives tense and strained in a violent world, we seek that peace which is the gift of Thy grace to all those who yield their wills to Thy will, their minds to Thy truth, their hearts to Thy obedience. O God, our God, Thou hast fashioned us so that we faint and fall without the breath of Thy presence. Thou art the desire beneath desire. When upon our mortal days there is lifted the light of Thy countenance even trivial rounds and the common tasks are arched with the aura of infinite peace and power and joy. In the brightness of Thy throne we become sure of the vital and eternal things that are stronger than the noise of the world and against which the gates of hell cannot prevail.

Make us such ministers of Thine to this stricken generation that the golden dream of the ages may transfigure a cleansed and chastened earth as the waiting continents and the isles of the sea are linked in a new fellowship for the promotion of Thy glory and the good of all mankind. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

### DESIGNATION OF A PRESIDING OFFICER

The Secretary (Edwin A. Halsey) read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,  
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,  
Washington, D. C., September 28, 1943.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. CARL A. HATCH, a Senator from the State of New Mexico, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARTER GLASS,  
President pro tempore.

Mr. HATCH thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Friday, September 24, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the

Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were subsequently signed by the Vice President:

S. 135. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of the General State Authority of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania;

S. 159. An act for the relief of the United States Parcel Post Building Co., of Cleveland, Ohio;

S. 332. An act for the relief of Velma Pikkarainen;

S. 426. An act for the relief of Maj. George E. Golding;

S. 462. An act for the relief of Primo Giordanengo and Angie Giordanengo;

S. 626. An act for the relief of Angeline Arbuckle;

S. 652. An act for the relief of Joseph A. Lassiter;

S. 787. An act for the relief of Samuel Jacobs and Harry Jacobs;

S. 789. An act to provide for the mailing of annual notices to owners of tax-exempt properties in the District of Columbia;

S. 824. An act for the relief of Dr. J. W. Goin;

S. 915. An act for the relief of Robert Kish Lee and Elizabeth Kish;

S. 929. An act for the relief of Dr. Douglas E. Lawson;

S. 1223. An act to fix the compensation of the Recorder of Deeds of the District of Columbia and the Superintendent of the National Training School for Girls; and

S. 1224. An act to designate the Public Library of the District of Columbia a public depository for governmental publications.

### CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Guffey	Radcliffe
Andrews	Gurney	Reed
Austin	Hatch	Revercomb
Bailey	Hawkes	Reynolds
Ball	Hayden	Robertson
Barkley	Hill	Russell
Brewster	Holman	Scruggam
Bridges	Johnson, Calif.	Shipstead
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Buck	Kilgore	Taft
Burton	Langer	Thomas, Idaho
Bushfield	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Capper	McClellan	Tobey
Caraway	McFarland	Tunnell
Chavez	McKellar	Tydings
Clark, Idaho	McNary	Vandenberg
C'ark, Mo.	Maloney	Van Nuys
Connally	Maybank	Wagner
Danaher	Mead	Wallgren
Davis	Millikin	Walsh
Downey	Moore	Wheeler
Eastland	Murdock	Wherry
Ellender	Murray	White
Ferguson	Nye	Wiley
George	O'Daniel	Willis
Gerry	O'Mahoney	Wilson
Gillette	Overton	
Green	Pepper	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] is absent on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] is necessarily absent.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] is necessarily absent as a member of the special committee of the Senate investigating matters pertaining to the conduct of the war.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] are necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-five Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

### GOVERNMENT FOR PUERTO RICO—AMENDMENT OF ORGANIC ACT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read by the legislative clerk, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

When sovereignty over Puerto Rico was transferred from Spain to the United States in 1899, the Treaty of Paris did not settle the exact position of Puerto Rico in the orbit of American sovereignty. It left that for determination by the Congress of the United States. After a brief interval of military government, the Foraker Act in 1900 established a framework of colonial government. Under it the legislative assembly was given rather limited powers; and the Governor and an appointed executive council held the real substance of authority. The inhabitants were to be citizens of Puerto Rico—American nationals, but not citizens.

In 1917, the Puerto Ricans received full American citizenship. At the same time the Congress, by the Organic Act of Puerto Rico, created a full-fledged legislature, and provided for a much greater participation by Puerto Ricans in the executive department of the Government, reserving to the President the power of appointment of only the Governor, the attorney general, the commissioner of education, the auditor, and the justices of the supreme court. This action of the Congress in 1917 bound Puerto Rico much more closely to the United States and provided a substantial advance in local self-government.

During the 45 years which have passed since the occupation of the island by the United States the economic situation of the Puerto Rican people, although materially improved in some respects, has not changed in essential character. Instead of development toward economic self-reliance, there has been a steady tendency to become more dependent upon outside markets for disposal of the

single great crop, sugar, and upon outside sources for food, clothing, building materials, and most of the other necessities. Partly because of economic and geographical factors and partly because of tariff preferences and shipping laws, these relationships are, by now, almost wholly with the continental United States.

The population of Puerto Rico has increased from 950,000 to about 2,000,000, making this one of the most densely inhabited areas on earth. Depending upon the obligation implied by our active participation in their development, Puerto Ricans have been encouraged, insofar as they could, to try to attain American standards of life. Wages in Puerto Rico, for instance, are several times as high as those in nearby islands not under our flag; literacy is much higher than in other Caribbean islands; the percentage of those who speak English has grown progressively in every decade; our agencies of public health have made inroads on diseases endemic in the island; and serious attempts have been and are being made to provide better housing and to raise the levels of nutrition.

During the 45 years of our sovereignty, the elements of world military and naval strategy have changed also. When the island was first brought under our flag, the Panama Canal had not yet been dug, and the airplane had not yet been invented. The Caribbean was something of a backwater in the broad current of world affairs. When the present war became imminent, however, it was obvious that the chain of islands running in a great arc from Florida to the shoulder of South America, enclosing the Caribbean Sea, formed a vast natural shield for the Panama Canal, suited in distance and conformation to the uses of the military plane. And of this island shield, Puerto Rico is the center. Its possession or control by any foreign power—or even the remote threat of such possession—would be repugnant to the most elementary principles of national defense.

It has long been the policy of the Government of the United States progressively to reinforce the machinery of self-government in its territories and island possessions. The principles for which we are now fighting require that we should recognize the right of all our citizens—whether continental or overseas—to the greatest possible degree of home rule and also of participation in the benefits and responsibilities of our Federal system.

Puerto Ricans of all political parties, however divergent their views as to the political future of the island, are united in asking for the right to elect their own Governor. I believe that they are entitled to it.

The Congress will recall that on March 9 of this year, I recommended to it "that it consider as soon as possible an amendment of the organic law of Puerto Rico to permit the people of Puerto Rico to elect their own Governor and to redefine the functions and powers of the Federal Government and of the government of Puerto Rico respectively." In order to

assist in framing the required legislation, in case the Congress should decide to grant this power to the people of Puerto Rico, I appointed a committee composed of an equal number of Puerto Ricans and continental residents. I requested them to make a study of the amendments to the organic act necessary to authorize the election of a Governor and to redefine the relationships of the Federal and Insular Governments affected thereby.

That committee met in Washington almost daily for 3 weeks this last summer. It has sent me a full report of its recommendations in the form of a proposed bill and a summary statement of such bill.

I am forwarding this report of the committee to the Congress for consideration by them. The legislation was drawn by the committee itself, and I am submitting it as a possible guide for such action as the Congress may decide to take.

Under this bill the people of Puerto Rico would be given an opportunity for the free exercise of the powers of local self-government in all three branches of government—executive, legislative, and judicial. There would be reserved to the President the power to veto only such measures passed by the legislature as were beyond the proper field of local self-government. There would be a United States Commissioner General in Puerto Rico upon whom would devolve the responsibility for the execution of the laws of the United States, and for the coordination and supervision of the activities of Federal civilian agencies, and their correlation with the activities of insular agencies. He would also have authority to require reports of all activities of the insular government for transmittal to the President through the Secretary of the Interior. The fiscal relationship of the insular government to the Federal Government would not be altered, nor would the ultimate power of Congress to legislate for the territory. The people of the island would, however, be given assurance of the intention of Congress to obtain the concurrence of the people of the island before imposing upon them any further changes in the organic act.

There is no reason why their Governor and other officials should continue to be appointed from without. At this stage of Puerto Rican development, the withholding of this right is no longer necessary. There is no question of the Puerto Ricans' ability now to administer their own internal affairs and to assume the attendant responsibility.

It is recommended by the report of the committee that this fact be recognized at once. I agree that this should be done, and suggest that the Congress should consider it as a matter of right and justice for Puerto Ricans.

As to the future, it is not proposed that the political development of Puerto Rico be left to chance. On the contrary, it is recommended by the committee that a continuing joint advisory council, under the chairmanship of the Secretary of the Interior, be appointed to conduct

continuing economic and political studies of all the elements of the Puerto Rican situation and of American necessities, to guide us for the future. This council must report at least once during the life of each Congress.

In addition to the Secretary of the Interior, the council would consist of the Governor of Puerto Rico and the Commissioner General, who shall serve ex officio, and also four persons to be appointed by the President of the United States, and five persons to be appointed by the Governor of Puerto Rico.

The government of Puerto Rico should not be static; it should be changed and developed as conditions warrant. It is equally important that the economic situation of the Puerto Ricans should be improved. I am confident that with patience and cooperation both these objectives can be attained.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, September 28, 1943.

#### STRIKES IN DEFENSE INDUSTRIES—LETTER FROM PHILIP MURRAY, PRESIDENT OF THE CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from Philip Murray, president of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS,  
Washington, D. C., September 15, 1943.  
Hon. HENRY A. WALLACE,

President of the Senate,  
The Capitol, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. WALLACE: With the return of the Members of Congress from their recess contacts with their home districts, it is my sincere hope that Congress will have found the recess fruitful in terms of a fuller and sounder understanding of the needs of a Nation at war.

In the days just preceding the recess both Houses of Congress, acting in haste, rushed through the passage over the President's veto of an ill-considered piece of legislation which has come to be known as the Smith-Connally Act. At that time the responsible labor organizations of the country warned in the light of their long experience that the bill was ill-advised and was actually calculated to interfere with the progress of American war production. We pointed out that at a time when the responsible bodies of organized labor had given and were fulfilling, as they are today, their no-strike pledge, the bill proposed to set up legalized machinery whereby irresponsible elements might force strike votes and thereby give the appearance of legal sanction to interference with war production.

In our judgment at that time we were supported by the heads of every Government agency engaged in work related to war production and labor relations. The warnings of these officials were repeated in the veto message of the President. In the face of these warnings, however, a group in Congress succeeded in maneuvering the enactment of the measure within minutes after receipt of word of the President's veto.

It is an unfortunate fact that even the few months which have elapsed since the passage of the bill have proved our fears to have been well-founded. The responsible bodies of organized labor have reiterated their determination to stand firm on their no-strike pledge. The new statute, however, has in practice rendered performance of that pledge

even more difficult. Those difficulties have been further increased under the act by virtue of an interpretation rendered by the Attorney General which permits any minority group, however slight, to utilize the machinery of the statute, to bring about a strike vote in any plant, however large. Under the Smith-Connally Act now 2 workers in a plant of 20,000 may force a strike vote among the 20,000 workers.

In the light of the experience of these last few months a very serious duty falls on the shoulders of congressional leaders. The situation does not permit of arguments as to whether error is to be admitted or as to where blame is to be placed. This Nation is at war and cannot permit such considerations to stand in the way of a policy which will mean the removal of obstacles to victory. The Smith-Connally Act has proven itself to be such an obstacle. Spokesmen for large business groups and prominent metropolitan newspapers throughout the country have recognized this fact and have urged Congress to repeal this legislation.

I trust and hope that the leadership of this Congress will prove its stature by undertaking the task of removing the Smith-Connally Act from the statute books, so that organized labor in America may move forward unimpeded in its consistent and devoted drive to ever-increased war production.

Sincerely yours,

PHILIP MURRAY.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

RUBY KEYES OR RUBY AMELIA MORIARTY  
KEYES—RUBY AMELIA NORTON

A letter from the Attorney General stating that on March 1, 1943, there was forwarded a recommendation that deportation should be suspended pursuant to the provisions of section 19 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended, in the case of Ruby Keyes or Ruby Amelia Moriarty Keyes, now known as Ruby Amelia Norton, CR 1334, and also stating that subsequent to the submission of the case the alien's conduct has been found to be not that of a person of good moral character and upon a full investigation the Attorney General is satisfied that she is one who is not entitled to the provisions of the act and therefore he wishes to withdraw her name from the group submitted to Congress for its determination during this session; to the Committee on Immigration.

#### DONATION AND CONVEYANCE OF TELEPHONE AND TELEGRAPH BUILDING, ANCHORAGE, ALASKA

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, submitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to donate and convey, on behalf of the United States, to Jack Henry Post, No. 1, of the American Legion, Anchorage, Alaska, the wood-frame building, known as the Telephone and Telegraph Building, located on lots 7 and 8 in block 17, Anchorage Townsite (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

#### FIFTH REPORT OF OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator of the Office of Price Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the fifth report of the Administration covering the period ended April 30, 1943 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

#### REGISTRANTS DEFERRED FOR OCCUPATIONAL REASONS UNDER SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

A letter from the Director of the Selective Service System, transmitting adjusted sched-

ules of registrants deferred by the Selective Service System for occupational reasons, containing information received subsequent to his letter of September 17, 1943, transmitting his last report in response to law (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

#### PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS OF A DEPARTMENT AND VARIOUS OFFICES

Letters from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, Director of the National Resources Planning Board, Director for Committee for Congested Production Areas, and the officer in charge of the American Battle Monuments Commission, submitting, pursuant to law, estimates of personnel requirements for the quarter ending December 31, 1943; and also letters from the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency and the Administrator of the Office of Price Administration, submitting revised estimates for the quarter ending September 30, 1943 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Civil Service.

#### AMENDMENT OF ACT RELATING TO THE LEVYING AND COLLECTING OF TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS IN THE DISTRICT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 881) to amend an act entitled "An act relating to the levying and collecting of taxes and assessments, and for other purposes," approved June 25, 1938, which was, on page 1, to strike out all after line 6 over to and including line 15 on page 2 and insert:

SEC. 12. Annually and subsequent to July 1, the assessor of the District of Columbia shall mail to the record owner of each lot or parcel of land upon which a real-estate tax has been levied by the District of Columbia as of July 1 of the same year, a notice of the amount of such real-estate tax, and of the manner in which the amount of such real-estate tax is payable according to law; and such notice shall state whether there were any delinquent real-estate taxes unpaid on July 1 of the year in which such notice is sent: *Provided*, That if the address of the owner be unknown, such notice shall be mailed to his agent, if known; and if there be more than one record owner of any lot or parcel, notice mailed to one of the owners shall be deemed compliance with this section: *Provided further*, That nothing in this section shall affect in any way the provisions of section 3 of this act: *Provided further*, That failure of the property owner or his agent to receive such notice shall not relieve the property owner of the payment of any penalty or interest as required by law for the delinquent payment of real-estate taxes.

Mr. McCARRAN. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

#### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution of the Council of the City of Waukegan, Ill., favoring the enactment of legislation to prescribe a measure of diversion which would be permissible at Chicago when the waters of Lake Michigan are at a mean level which is deemed higher than the safe conduct of interstate commerce and navigation and the rights of the riparian owners warrant; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition, numerous signed, of sundry citizens of McLouth, Kans., praying for the

enactment of Senate bill 860, relating to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

#### SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS BY FOREIGN GROUPS—RESOLUTION OF MINISTERIAL UNION OF WASHINGTON

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I send to the desk and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, and referred to the District of Columbia Committee, a resolution adopted by the Washington Ministerial Union at its first fall meeting on Monday, September 27, remonstrating against S. 1338, a bill to permit the granting of beverage licenses in the District of Columbia to service clubs of other United Nations.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Ministerial Union of Washington and vicinity having learned the purpose and procedures of Senate Resolution 1338 and House Joint Resolution 160, hereby records its unequivocal opposition to both these proposed enactments and instructs its officers to convey this opposition in writing and in person to the proper committees of the House and Senate, and respectfully request that both of these bills be referred back to its District Committee by both Senate and House, and that public hearings be held before they are reported to the respective Houses of Congress.

ARMAND T. EYLER,  
President.

#### UNIFORM FREIGHT RATES AND CLASSIFICATION—LETTER FROM KANSAS CITY LIVESTOCK INTERESTS

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I present an important letter in the nature of a petition signed by R. A. Willis, president, Kansas City Livestock Exchange; J. C. Cash, president, Kansas City Stock Yards Co.; and Lester Metzger, president of the Kansas City Traders Live Stock Exchange, speaking for the livestock producers patronizing the Kansas City market, and urging the defeat of the following bills and resolutions: House bills 2378, 2391, 2435, 2436, 2519, 2547, 2645, 3172, and 3183; Senate bills 947, 1030, and 1124; Senate Joint Resolutions 46 and 75.

I believe the livestock organizations strongly oppose these bills and joint resolutions as they undertake to establish uniform freight rates and classification for application throughout the Nation. I ask that the letter in the nature of a petition be appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter in the nature of a petition was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KANSAS CITY LIVESTOCK MARKET,  
Kansas City, Mo., September 8, 1943.  
Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The Kansas City Livestock Exchange, the Kansas City Stockyards Co., the Traders Livestock Exchange, and the livestock producers patronizing the Kansas City market respectfully urge your help and cooperation

in defeating the passage of the above bills and joint resolutions. They propose to establish uniform freight rates and classification for application throughout the Nation. We believe the proposals to be economically unsound and adverse to the best interest of the agricultural sections of the West and Southwest, particularly the livestock grower and feeder.

You will recall freight rates, rules, and classification regulations now in effect in the West and Southwest were established as a result of the Hoch-Smith resolution, and have been in effect since January, 1932. The first decision of the Interstate Commerce Commission regarding livestock as a result of the Hoch-Smith resolution is recorded in volume 176, I. C. C. 1. In establishing these rates Congress specifically directed the Interstate Commerce Commission to put into effect on agricultural products, including livestock, "the lowest possible freight rates, rules, and classification regulations compatible with the maintenance of adequate rail transportation service." It was after years of public hearings and investigations by the Interstate Commerce Commission our present basis of livestock rates was established.

At present cattle are raised in Texas, pastured in the Osage country and Flint Hills, fattened in the feedlots of the Corn Belt States, and transported to the packing centers in the West and East, and the meat distributed to the consuming centers. Cattle originating in Texas, moving as described above, are transported on one through rate from their point of birth to the packing establishment. There are in effect intricate transit rules and regulations, particularly adapted to the nature of the business, that have proven entirely satisfactory to the livestock and meat-packing industry of the Nation, and these should not be disturbed. We should not lose track of the fact this basis of rates and transit arrangements was established as a result of the Hoch-Smith resolution, and, as stated by the Interstate Commerce Commission, they are the lowest possible freight rates and classification regulations that can be established compatible with adequate transportation service.

The proponents of the above bills would break down our western basis of rates merely for the sake of uniformity. It is unreasonable and economically unsound to tear down our Hoch-Smith basis of rates merely for the sake of uniformity. Here in the West and Southwest livestock is transported in train-load lots, whereas in the East and Southeast a single carload is considered a large consignment. It is evident that if the rate on cattle from New York to Boston (where there is no movement) is reduced, there must be an increase in the rates from Emporia, Kans., to Kansas City in order to offset this reduction. Who would benefit from a reduction in cattle rates from New York to Boston? But think of the disastrous effects that would result in an increase from Emporia to Kansas City. And think of the disastrous effects to the Flint Hill and Osage sections were the transit privileges canceled or made uniform with the cattle transit privileges from New York to Boston. Uniformity as proposed can have but one effect, and that is increases in the livestock rates in the West and reductions in the Southeast and East.

If the proponents of this legislation are seeking adjustments in the cattle rates from Atlanta to Nashville, or Atlanta to New York City, there are avenues open for such an adjustment with the Interstate Commerce Commission. It seems to us wholly unfair and unjust to involve rates in the West and Southwest merely to seek an adjustment in the South or in the East.

The rates, rules, and classification regulations now in effect in this section of the Nation are adaptable to the movement of

the livestock that is produced and slaughtered in this section. We urge you to use your good offices with a view of seeing that this basis of freight rates and classification is not disturbed merely to bring about uniformity with some section of the country that has no need for such a basis of rates or transit arrangements.

Yours very truly,

KANSAS CITY LIVE STOCK EXCHANGE,  
R. A. WILLIS, *President*.  
KANSAS CITY STOCK YARDS CO.,  
J. C. CASH, *President*.  
KANSAS CITY TRADERS  
LIVE STOCK EXCHANGE,  
LESTER METZGER, *President*.

#### REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. RADCLIFFE, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

H. R. 3291. A bill to amend the National Housing Act, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 418).

#### GRANTING OF BEVERAGE LICENSES IN THE DISTRICT TO SERVICE CLUBS OF OTHER UNITED NATIONS—RECOMMIT- TAL OF A BILL

On motion by Mr. McCARRAN, the bill (S. 1338) to permit the granting of beverage licenses in the District of Columbia to service clubs of other United Nations was taken from the calendar and ordered to be recommitted to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

#### BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BUCK:

S. 1383. A bill to provide for the withdrawal from circulation of 1-cent pieces coined after December 23, 1942, and to prohibit the coinage of 1-cent pieces not readily distinguishable from coins of higher denomination; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BURTON:

S. 1384. A bill to provide for the inspection and registration of bicycles in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. AIKEN:

S. 1385. A bill to provide for the improvement of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence basin in the interest of national defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 1386. A bill making it a misdemeanor to stow away on aircraft and providing punishment therefor; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WHEELER:

S. 1387. A bill to extend the time within which the States of Montana, North Dakota, and Wyoming may negotiate and enter into a compact or agreement for division of the waters of the Yellowstone River; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 1388. A bill to extend the time within which the States of Montana, North Dakota, and Wyoming may negotiate and enter into a compact or agreement for division of the waters of the Yellowstone River; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. WHERRY:

S. 1389. A bill for the relief of Jesse V. Craig; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

(Mr. DAVIS introduced Senate bill 1390, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1391. A bill for the relief of W. R. Jordan and Mabel Jordan; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GEORGE:

S. 1392. A bill for the relief of Dewey H. Davis; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 1393. A bill for the relief of Walter R. Jones;

S. 1394. A bill for the relief of Reverend R. E. McKinney; and

S. 1395. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Norma S. McKinney and Mrs. Ella Swenson; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1396. A bill for the relief of Isidor Blanc; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 1397. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act relative to restrictions applicable to Indians of the Five Civilized Tribes in Oklahoma," approved January 27, 1933; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BAILEY:

S. J. Res. 82. Joint resolution to create the War Shipping Field Service; to the Committee on Commerce.

#### ALLOWANCES TO OFFICERS IN THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I have recently been informed that the administration and interpretation of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 are resulting in certain discriminations and hardships which I am certain are not consistent either with the intent or the purposes which the Congress sought to achieve by enacting this law.

I refer specifically to the fact that commissioned officers in the armed forces of the United States have been denied the payment of rental and subsistence allowances for dependent parents, in those cases when such parents are the adopted parents of the officer concerned.

The Comptroller General has so ruled on these cases, because in all other sections of the law, the Congress specifically stated that the term "parent" should include "parents through adoption," whereas the Congress failed to include that definition in the section of the act dealing with the pay and allowances of commissioned officers.

I need not recount the undesirable and discriminatory effects which the present application of this law is having upon all commissioned officers in the armed forces whose adopted parents are now dependent upon them for their principal means of support.

I am certain that my colleagues will be most anxious to correct this situation, and I am, therefore, introducing a bill making appropriate amendment to the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, together with a letter which I received from Mrs. Mary Tierney, of Pittsburgh, Pa., setting forth the serious effects which the present operation of this law is now having upon dependent mothers whose adopted sons are now serving in the United States armed forces.

I also ask that both the amendment and the letter cited be referred to the

appropriate committee for early study and consideration.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1390) to amend section 4 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended, was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That section 4 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended, is amended by striking out the period at the end of such section and inserting in lieu thereof a colon and the following: "Provided further, That the term 'father or mother' shall be held to include a father or mother through adoption."

SWISSVALE, PITTSBURGH, PA.

Senator JAMES J. DAVIS,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Your help is sought in correcting an injustice concerning the refusal of the Army to pay increased allowances to my adopted son, Capt. James E. Loughran, now serving in the United States Army.

It is my understanding that the Finance Office of the Army will not pay any rental and subsistence allowances to him for my support, because the Congress, in writing the pay act for officers, did not specifically state that the word "parent" was intended to include "parents through adoption"; and the finance officer believes the Congress intended that such parents as myself were to be excluded from such benefits.

During the past years I have stood in the place of his mother since her death, and I contributed substantially toward his college education. But, at the present time, I am dependent upon him, and nearly all my income consists of the money which he sends me each month out of his pay.

I am sure that you will appreciate the inconsistency of the present situation:

Were James an enlisted man, instead of an officer, the Army would recognize me as his mother without any question, for all purposes, and pay the established allowances. The Army does accept me as his mother in connection with his Army insurance policy, and I am told that if he should die while in service, the Army would acknowledge me as his mother and, as such, declare me eligible for death payments.

It seems unfair that he should not be allowed to obtain whatever benefits have been provided by law. I am sure that it cannot have been your intention or that of the other Senators, that the few mothers who find themselves in my position, should be excluded from the help extended through the payment of allowances to our officer sons, merely because we are parents through adoption. There cannot be many of us, but there is probably some hardship involved in each case.

I will certainly appreciate your investigation, and any assistance which you may give in correcting the present condition.

Sincerely yours,

MARY TIERNEY.

#### DEFERMENT OF FATHERS FROM THE DRAFT—AMENDMENT

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, for the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] and myself I submit an amendment intended to be proposed by us jointly to Senate bill 763, the pending bill. The amendment has been printed and is on the desks of Senators, so I take it that it is unnecessary to have it read at this time, but I ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will lie on the table, and be printed, and printed in the RECORD.

The amendment is as follows:

Amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. BAILEY and Mr. CLARK of Missouri to the bill (S. 763) exempting certain married men who have children from liability under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, viz: Strike out lines 6 to 11, inclusive, and in lieu thereof insert the following:

"(1) After the beginning of the second calendar month following the date of enactment of this subsection and until the termination of hostilities in the present war as proclaimed by the President—

"(1) no registrant between the ages of 18 and 38 shall be permitted to occupy or continue to be employed in or be appointed to any civilian position in or under the Federal Government unless (A) such registrant was married prior to December 8, 1941, and has a child or children under 18 years of age, or (B) such registrant is deferred from training and service by reason of physical disqualification or has been honorably discharged from the land or naval forces, or (C) the services of such registrant in such position are certified by the head of the department or agency within which such registrant is employed or appointed to be indispensable to the operations of such department or agency; and

"(2) no man between the ages of 18 and 38 who is serving as a commissioned officer in the land or naval forces of the United States shall be stationed or assigned to duty in the District of Columbia or Arlington County, Va., for a period or periods in excess of 30 days in the aggregate during any calendar year unless (A) such man was married prior to December 8, 1941, and has a child or children under 18 years of age, or (B) such man is physically disqualified for active combat service, or (C) the services of such man in the District of Columbia or Arlington County, Va., are certified by the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, as the case may be, to be indispensable to the operations of the land or naval forces of the United States.

"Any certification made in accordance with the requirements of this subsection shall contain a statement of the reasons for determining that the services of the individual with respect to whom such certification is made are indispensable, and a copy of any such certification shall be transmitted to the Congress within 30 days from the date such certification is made.

"Sec. 2. The provisions of this act shall not be construed to repeal or modify the provisions of the act entitled 'An act relating to the selective-service deferment, on occupational grounds, of persons employed by the Federal Government,' approved April 8, 1943."

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to prevent the use in civilian Government positions, or in certain positions in the military service, of men who are qualified for active combat duty."

#### ADDRESS BY SENATOR LUCAS IN TRIBUTE TO DEFENDERS OF POLAND

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator Lucas at the Tribute to Poland Day meeting in East St. Louis, Ill., on September 26, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### ADDRESS BY SENATOR LUCAS AT MEETING OF INDIANA DEMOCRATIC EDITORS

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address

delivered by Senator Lucas at a meeting of Indiana Democratic Editors, held at French Lick, Ind., on September 25, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### THE BASTILLE OF TYRANNY IS FALLING— ADDRESS BY SENATOR PEPPER

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Bastille of Tyranny Is Falling," delivered by him before the National Society of the Ahepa at Cincinnati and printed in the September-October 1941 issue of the Ahepan, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY TO THE CATHOLIC KNIGHTS OF WISCONSIN

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by him before the Catholic Knights of Wisconsin at their convention at Beaver Dam, Wis., September 9, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### HOW FAR CAN WE GO IN ORGANIZING PEACE?—ADDRESS BY SENATOR BURTON

[Mr. BURTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "How Far Can We Go in Organizing Peace?" delivered by him in Christ Church, New York City, September 15, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### CONFUSION AND UNCERTAINTY AMONG BUSINESSMEN

[Mr. MOORE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article, letters, and an address by him relating to the supply of automobiles and confusion among businessmen, which appear in the Appendix.]

#### POLICING THE AXIS: THE GERMAN PHASE—ARTICLE BY SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Policing the Axis—The German Phase," prepared by him at the request of the Washington branch of the Commission to Study the Organization of Peace, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### INCREASED FOOD PRODUCTION—AVAILABILITY OF FARM MACHINERY

[Mr. NYE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from R. A. Lathrop, secretary-treasurer of the North Dakota Implement Dealers' Association, regarding the availability of farm machinery, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### GENERAL MARSHALL'S RELIGIOUS BELIEFS AND PRACTICES—LETTER BY RAY D. BROWN AND ARTICLE BY WILLIAM L. STIDGER

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Ray D. Brown, adjutant and public-relations and welfare secretary of the Salvation Army, and an article entitled "The Christian General," by William L. Stidger, published in the September 25, 1943, issue of the War Cry, which appear in the Appendix.]

#### POST-WAR PLANNING

[Mr. HATCH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Russia Is Forcing Issues as We Delay Post-War Plan," by James B. Reston, from the New York Times of September 27, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### POULTRY AND DAIRY FEED SITUATION IN NEW HAMPSHIRE

[Mr. TOBEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from

Charles R. Hopkins, of Greenfield, N. H., enclosing minutes of the meeting of the New Hampshire Feed Mixers and Dealers, together with a letter addressed to the feed mixers supplying feeders in New Hampshire, and a table of estimated feed requirements of livestock in New Hampshire, which appear in the Appendix.]

#### THE O. P. A. AND THE CHEESE INDUSTRY OF WISCONSIN

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an editorial entitled "O. P. A. Has a Duty To Perform," written by C. E. Broughton, editor of the Sheboygan Press, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### INTERNATIONAL BIMETALLISM—ARTICLE IN THE NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. MURDOCK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an article headed "Bimetallism held needed by world," published in the New York Times of September 27, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### LAND-USE PLANNING

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record a letter from E. J. Haslerud, director of extension and chairman of the North Dakota Agricultural Advisory Council, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### DEFERMENT OF FATHERS FROM THE DRAFT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 763) exempting certain married men who have children from liability under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment of the Committee on Military Affairs.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, line 10, after the word "act", it is proposed to insert "until January 1, 1944", so as to read:

That section 5 of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(m) Every registrant who was married prior to December 8, 1941, who has maintained a bona fide family relationship with his family since that date, and who has a child or children under 18 years of age shall be exempt from training and service under this act until January 1, 1944."

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, during my 20 years of service in the Senate I have never risen to speak upon a more important piece of legislation, with the possible exception of the time when I sought to keep the country out of this war, than that which is now pending, nor have I ever spoken in the Senate upon a more just piece of legislation or one which would more materially affect the welfare and the future of the United States of America.

The pending bill was introduced by me in February of this year. It was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs. In May the committee held a hearing on it. In July the bill was reported from the Committee on Military Affairs by a vote of 11 to 3.

At the time when Congress took the summer recess, I was informed by reliable administration authorities and by others that the drafting of fathers probably would not be necessary this year. However, while Congress was away on vaca-

tion, in August the order was issued that fathers would be drafted October 1. I immediately telegraphed the Democratic leader of the Senate and the Democratic leader of the House, asking that Congress be reconvened, because at that time I foresaw exactly what would happen upon the reconvening of the Congress. However, in the telegram I received from our distinguished Democratic leader, he said there would be plenty of time to act upon the matter, if Congress saw fit to do so, after the reconvening.

Immediately upon the reconvening of Congress, our Democratic leader and others said they did not know the facts and had not had time to learn them. They asked for a hearing before the Committee on Military Affairs. At the hearing testimony was given by the Under Secretary of War, General McNarney, General Marshall, Admiral King, and numerous representatives of the Selective Service System. Finally, when the newspapers carried conflicting stories as to whether Mr. Baruch was to be called before the committee, I insisted upon his being called. I did so because of the fact that he had written a report which to a large extent substantiated the statements which have been made with reference to inefficiency and to waste of manpower in both government and industry.

Mr. President, I have said that no father in the United States should be called, and I repeat the statement that no father should be called, until the slackers are taken out of the Government bureaus. Fathers should not be called until the slackers are taken out of the industries where they are hiding today. I say "slackers" because that is exactly what they are. Before American homes are broken up, before children are driven into the streets, let the slackers in the Government bureaus, the bureaucrats who are demanding sacrifices on the part of American businessmen, American mothers, and the babies of the country—let the slackers, I say, be driven out of the bureaus and into the Army where they belong.

Let any Member of the Senate stand up and say, if he chooses to do so, that he wants to drive American children into the streets, that he wants to drive fathers into the Army, while the slackers are permitted to remain in hiding—some of them single men and some of them married men whose wives are working in Government departments. Let any Member of the Senate stand up and state that he wants that done, and then let him go home and tell his people that is what he stands for in the Senate.

O Mr. President, I am told I should not press this measure because it might bring disunity in the country. I am for unity in the war effort; but I am not for unity in behalf of inefficiency in government. I am not for inefficiency and waste in government; I am not for inefficiency on the part of a lot of spend-thrifts who are throwing away the taxpayers' money like drunken sailors, and I am not for unity in permitting many men who have cost-plus contracts to hoard their employees, to assemble large

groups of single men, if the fathers of children are to be drafted, and if their wives and mothers are to be forced into industry.

I am told that I am trying to substitute my judgment for the judgment of General Marshall. Nothing of the kind. There is not a scintilla of evidence in the Record to that effect. General Marshall does not say that he wants to leave slackers in the Government service. General Marshall does not say that he wants industries to hoard labor. General Marshall said, in answer to a question by the Senator from California [Mr. Downey], that he prefers single men to married men. He said that if a man's wife were left with small children to live upon the pittance allowed her when her husband went to war, and he were worried as to whether or not his family had proper housing and proper clothing, and whether or not they were going to have enough food, that man would not make a good soldier.

I know that a distinguished lady said the other day, "My boys are fathers, and they are in the Army." There are many married men in the Army who are officers. I am not talking about fathers who are leaving home to become officers. I am not talking about fathers who are the sons of Senators or Representatives, or who are the heads of great corporations, and who have money enough to provide the proper care for their families. I am talking about the man in the street, the working man, the little fellow. I am talking about destroying the small business man of this country by taking him from a business which he has built up, while slackers remain behind the lines.

I know that some of the leaders tried to put words into General Marshall's mouth. They tried to get him to say that he had to have fathers, but he refused to say so. They tried to get General McNarney to say it, but he refused to do so. They tried to get Admiral King to say it, but he refused to do so. General Marshall said that he wanted a certain number of men, but that it was up to the War Manpower Commission to find them.

Let us see where that leads us. To repeat, I introduced this bill last February. Was anything done to see that slackers in the Government were put into the Army? Was anything done by the Government of the United States to prevent hoarding of labor, and to see that slackers who were hiding in industry were taken out and placed where they should be? Nothing at all.

Upon whose shoulders rests the responsibility? Mr. President, it rests upon this administration, and this administration alone. We cannot escape the facts. If there is inefficiency in government—and we all recognize it—is it the fault of the Congress? We have given the administration the money. We have given it the power. Then whose responsibility is it? The responsibility for inefficiency in government, waste of manpower, and waste of money can rest upon the shoulders of only one person in this Government.

Mr. Baruch pointed out in his report that the bureaus were pulling and hauling, trying to build up more power. Whose responsibility is that? Is that the responsibility of the Congress? Is that the responsibility of General Marshall? Is it the result of the complacency of the American people? The American people are not complacent about the war effort, but they have been entirely too complacent about inefficiency in government. They have been too complacent about the waste of money by the Government. They have been entirely too complacent about many things which have been going on in Washington.

My statement about inefficiency in government is not the only one which has been made. There have been such statements by the chairman of the Truman committee, by the Costello committee, and by the Baruch committee. The condition is known to every Member of this body. But because of the mistakes which have been made by the Government, because of inefficiency, because of the squandering of money, and because of the waste of manpower, the children of this country are to be punished by having their fathers taken away from them and their homes broken up. Let Senators go back home and tell their people that that is what they stand for. That is the reason we are asked to take fathers, and that is the only reason we are asked to take fathers.

In a statement in the New York Times the other day, Mr. LaGuardia pointed out that if married men with children are to be taken away from their homes there will be 37,000 children whose homes will be broken up. I notice a great many children in the galleries. If we take their fathers away from them and make their mothers go to work in industry, what will become of the American home? What are we fighting for? Are we fighting to preserve the American home or are we fighting to break up the American home? Are we fighting for the future of America or are we fighting for some European idealism?

Let me read what Mr. Stimson said:

No legislation is needed to impress upon the War Department the importance of preserving the institution of the American home. It ranks first and foremost in the American way of life that this war is being fought to preserve.

That is what he says we are fighting for. Six months later we are asked to break up the American home. The administration has told the American people that one thing for which we are fighting is the future welfare of the children of America; and yet now, because of inefficiency and waste of manpower, the children of America are being told that their homes are to be destroyed and that their mothers must go to work in industry. The President has said, "Let the fathers go to work in industry." What is he saying? Suppose a young man is a lawyer or businessman. He is being told to give up his business, which he has built up over the years, and go into industry, in order to do what? In order to avoid the draft—in order to avoid being taken into the Army. Those men

are being told in effect, "Be slackers, so that when the war is over someone may point his finger at you and say, 'I was out there fighting in the hellholes of Guadalcanal or New Guinea, but you went into industry to hide.'" When the boys in the Army come back and see the waste and extravagance resulting from cost-plus contracts and the hoarding of labor, much of which consists of single men, what will they say to us?

I shall now read some letters, and I hope that Senators will listen to them. I hope that Senators have not made up their minds because of some editorials which have been published, or because of some headlines which have appeared in the newspapers. I hope Senators will listen to the evidence I shall produce, not on my behalf, but on behalf of children whose fathers are to be taken away.

A Senator said to me, "I am not going to vote for your bill." After making an outstanding speech, the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] said, "I am not going to vote for your bill because it is class legislation." Class legislation! The whole Selective Service Act is class legislation. Mr. President, when the President of the United States exempted from military service men over 38 years of age, or between the ages of 38 and 45, many of whom were physically fit to enter the Army, he was by edict applying class legislation to that group of persons. The Army released approximately 275,000 men who had been trained. They were men who perhaps could not engage in combat duty but could do the work of and relieve hundreds of fathers from being put into the Army, or relieve many men for combat service.

I have spoken concerning one of the aspects of the situation to which I wish to call further attention. I invite the attention of the Senate to letters from Protestant ministers from all over the country, and from leaders of the Catholic Church. Let me read an editorial from the Pilot. If I am not mistaken, this was one of the first publications of its kind in the United States. It was established in 1829, by the second Bishop of Boston, Mass. I quote:

#### IS THIS DANGEROUS MEASURE NECESSARY?

A part of the burden borne by civilians is the hesitations and the contradictions from "above" which make planning useless. Last autumn the people were urged to convert to coal. Then the wave of strikes set in, and there is talk now of rationing coal. The lifting of the ban on driving has been announced a half dozen times and as many times postponed.

But the most serious uncertainty, the one which cuts deepest at the values we treasure, is the impending induction of the so-called pre-Pearl Harbor fathers. The last official word is that the induction of these men will begin October 1. And yet just at this time the warning is issued that these responsible heads of families must get into essential work or submit to draft before October. So the draft is being used as leverage. One might say it is being used as a threat.

It is an extremely serious step our Government is considering. The family is in a bad enough way now. There is no need of rehearsing the figures on juvenile delinquency—obviously there never was a time when it was so important to save what is

left of family life in America. In God's plan, every child is provided with a mother and a father. Both are needed.

Now, these men who stayed at their accustomed jobs, who for the sake of their loved ones refused the gamble of fantastic salaries, which will vanish when the war ends, are to be penalized for the very qualities which support a nation's fabric—industry, prudence, loyalty to sacramental promises.

The Government will support their dependents. Who is, or what is, this enigmatic personality we call the Government? And what constitutes support? Will this mean that mother will have to leave her home and eke out Government support by her own exertions in a war plant? Which would signify, of course, more children running wild on the streets, new recruits to the ranks of juvenile delinquency.

Is this desperate recourse absolutely necessary? What about the hundreds of thousands of men who have been training in this country for a year and a half, who are still here? And if it is not strictly necessary, why is it being done? Can it possibly be that some of our officials, for doctrinaire reasons of their own, prefer the Government nursery to the home?

Mr. President, I also wish to invite attention to the fact that when the American Legion, Department of Maryland, recently met in Baltimore approximately 1,000 delegates went on record against the drafting of American fathers. I read from an Associated Press article:

A resolution opposing the drafting of pre-Pearl Harbor fathers was adopted by the approximately 1,000 delegates to the annual convention of the Department of Maryland, American Legion, in the closing session today.

The legionnaires also adopted a resolution favoring the publication of the names of persons seeking deferment from selective service.

The article then refers to the newly-elected State commander of the Legion.

The American Legion is one of the most patriotic societies in the country. Is it taking a stand against General Marshall? Are those 1,000 delegates saying that they are putting their judgment against that of General Marshall?

I invite attention to an Associated Press release under date of September 27, 1943, concerning the Maryland members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. It reads as follows:

BALTIMORE, September 27.—Maryland members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars are scheduled to make an effort to have the national organization go on record at its convention, opening in New York tomorrow against the drafting of fathers until all other classes of eligibles for military service have been exhausted.

A resolution to this effect, adopted by the State V. F. W. at its annual encampment, will be submitted to the national convention by Charles J. Peters, former Maryland V. F. W. commander who is chairman of a Baltimore County draft board.

Speaking, however, as a member of the national resolution committee, Mr. Peters said the resolution should not be misunderstood as seeking to block permanently the drafting of fathers.

He said that "I am going to make a fight for the resolution and voice opposition to the way selective service is being conducted with respect to the drafting of fathers."

Here is a letter from a selective-service board. I have received more than 5,000 letters since this question arose. I shall

read a few of the letters which give facts. They are not letters which merely state opinions, but they present facts.

I invite attention to a letter from the chairman of the local selective-service board of King William County, Va., enclosing a copy of a letter which he received from one of his board members. I should like to read both letters.

The chairman of the local board writes:

In my humble opinion, no system or department, could be more thoroughly honeycombed with chaos and confusion and a thorough lack of decision and policy. The local boards are daily flooded with a mass of regulations and memoranda from National and State headquarters, which add up generally to the sum total of nothing minus. The "buck" is always passed to the local boards and it is most remarkable that they have been able to induct as many men in the armed forces as are now there when operating under a system which has no policy and, daily through the press, are inviting men to secure employment which will exempt them from service in the armed forces of their country. Very recently Mr. McNutt issued a statement giving the fathers one more week to secure employment in, what he termed, essential industry. Should all fathers avail themselves of his invitation then there would be none left to be called into the armed forces and I do not know where the needs, as outlined by General Hershey, would be met.

From the letter which was enclosed, written by a member of local board No. 1, King William County, West Point, Va., I quote as follows:

I realize that it is not for selective service to determine the type of men that are to be used by the Army or Navy, but I have certain opinions founded upon the observations of the employment of personnel in the armed forces which preclude my voting to classify a pre-Pearl Harbor father for induction into the armed forces. An obvious fact is that individuals with defective physical or mental equipment are unfitted for combat duty, but there is, so far as I can observe, no good reason why an individual with slight physical handicap who is qualified to carry on in banking, insurance, transportation, or other business, could not be utilized in the armed services for duty within the bounds of the United States. By a means of simple multiplication, taking the husky able bodies whom I know in the Army and Navy that are carrying out assignments that could be efficiently handled by one-legged men and multiplying by vast possibilities in the Nation, it can be estimated that there are now a staggering number of men capable of combat assignments who could be replaced from the tremendous pool of power dammed up in 4-F classification.

General Hershey said that there were in excess of 3,000,000 men in the IV-F classification. Of that number the Army is taking into the service about 5 percent. In addition to that, after the Army takes men in the IV-F classification it is discharging them every day by the thousands from the camps throughout the United States. The writer of the letter says further:

Until such time as this condition has been corrected it would be impossible for me to vote, and maintain a clear conscience, to classify for inductance any pre-Pearl Harbor father.

Holding the view that I now have, it appears to me that further service with the

board would hardly be consistent practice, and you are at liberty to request the appointment of someone to replace me.

I read from a letter signed by Nathan H. Kaufman, chairman, Appeal Board No. 3, State of Maryland, from Baltimore, Md. He says:

I am very much interested in the fight you are making on the drafting of fathers and following are excerpts from a letter I wrote to General Hershey. I think this is the answer to the problem.

"In my opinion the date of recognized marriages should be changed from December 7, 1941, to September 16, 1940, the date when the Selective Service Act became law, and that no registrant should be considered for selective-service purposes as 'married men with children' if the children were born later than 9 months and 9 days after September 16, 1940.

"The following reasons are in support of the suggestion made above. First, all married men knew on September 16, 1940, that they might be called for military service; thus, if they acquired dependency after that date, they did so in the light of the 'imminence of their induction.'

"Second, most of the men who had been made eligible for service if the 'marriage with children' date were moved forward from December 7, 1941, to September 16, 1940, would be between the ages of 18 and 25, and would thus very likely make the most desirable soldiers.

"Third, the number of men made available under the suggested change of dates would be drafted in place of at least some of the men now being drafted out of war plants. In this regard I was asked by some of the persons present to state that we have been approached by many responsible officials of war plants located in Maryland, who have stated that they are not, and will not in the future, be able to work at a maximum efficiency with so many of their skilled workers being taken away from them.

"Fourth, the phrase 'imminence of induction,' as applied by local boards to the classification of married men, was frequently the cause for the difference of opinion among local boards and appeal boards, the result being that some boards emphasized certain dates as the basis for induction, while other boards used other dates for the same purpose. If my plan was followed, all of these instances would now be equalized.

"Fifth, general confusion exists regarding the whole subject of drafting married men with children, and as a result of the many conflicting statements made by various officials of Selective Service, Congressmen, and Senators, the efficiency of such men is being badly curtailed, resulting in the falling off of production of such men both in war producing plants and other plants necessary to the carrying on of essential industries."

I next refer to a letter from the local board of Wythe County, Wytheville, Va., from which I quote the following:

I wish to take this opportunity to congratulate you on your stand, with reference to drafting fathers for the armed forces. I happen to be a member of the Wythe County local board and feel that I am qualified, to a small extent at least, in being able to appreciate the unjustness and unfairness of such procedure. You are probably aware, of course, that there have been thousands of single men deferred for a great many reasons, and, in my humble opinion, it is unfair and unjust to take fathers into the service as long as these single men remain at home. I sincerely trust that you will be able to block this step on the part of the Selective Service officials and get a bill through the Senate prohibiting the taking of fathers as long as

there are single men available. It is my understanding that such a bill has passed the House.

I also wish to state that I have disagreed with your views on a great many public questions. However, I am with you on this question 100 percent, and if through your efforts you can keep the drafting of fathers from taking place until childless married men and single men have been called, you have rendered your country a great service.

Here is a letter addressed to Claude C. Earp, State director, Selective Service, Jefferson City, Mo., by the chairman of the Henry County local board. I quote from the letter as follows:

We received a bulletin some 2 months ago which stated industries must give up all single men between the ages of 18 and 25 by October. We were told that the replacement schedules would end a lot of uncertainties, that when Selective Service headquarters and industry are agreed on a certain date, draft boards could depend on having registrants at that time. Also that industry knew when the replacement schedule was made that they would have to release men on that date.

But now, in some cases they are allowing longer time.

Further on the writer of the letter says:

But the most confusing thing of all is the order to take married men with children in nondeferable industries. We received this broadening of lists Saturday, August 14, 1943. If we would start Monday morning to reclassify these men it would be September 15 before we could induct them as it takes considerable time to go over 2,500 to 3,000 files.

I also think it is a darn shame to draft married men with children until married men without children and single men are called.

I ask that the entire letter be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HATCH in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The entire letter is as follows:

AUGUST 20, 1943.

CLAUDE C. EARP,  
State Director, Selective Service,  
Jefferson City, Mo.

JOHN G. CHRISTY,  
Assistant State Director, Selective Service,  
Jefferson City, Mo.

DEAR FRIENDS: I am writing a few lines in regard to Selective Service's new rulings. I have always tried to keep up with the new regulations and have tried to follow instructions as near as possible and I wish to state that we have received wonderful cooperation from the State office, and you two, Colonel Earp and Colonel Christy, have been wonderful in trying to help us over the rough spots.

But there is so much confusion and uncertainty at present that I, for one, hardly know where we are.

We received a bulletin some 2 months ago which stated industries must give up all single men between the ages of 18 and 25 by October. We were told that the replacement schedules would end a lot of uncertainties; that when Selective Service headquarters and industry agreed on a certain date, draft boards could depend on having registrants at that time. Also that industry knew when the replacement schedule was made that they would have to release men on that date.

But now, in some cases they are allowing longer time. We have been told that when a company had a 6-month deferment on a

man they must make proof that they had tried to get a replacement through every means possible before they could get another deferment for their employee. This has not held good.

But the most confusing thing of all is the order to take married men with children in nondeferable industries. We received this broadening of lists Saturday, August 14, 1943. If we would start Monday morning to reclassify these men it would be September 15 before we could induct them as it takes considerable time to go over 2,500 to 3,000 files.

I also think it is a darn shame to draft married men with children until married men without children and single men are called.

I realize that a draft board is to carry out regulations as made by higher ups and men that are supposed to be smarter than the draft board. I also know that we live in a democracy and a democracy is where the people rule and Congress helps dictate the policies of this country. I also think the large part of the people believe married men should be called when the supply of married men without children and single men is exhausted.

I have always thought that a person should be proud to serve his country and ashamed to run to some other job to keep from going to the Army. Now the Government encourages people to run back to the farm and to defense plants. Of course, I am not saying they are not needed, but it certainly is making a lot of people call them draft evaders and a lot of them are.

Wouldn't it be better to draft labor that is not eligible for military service outright, rather than use selective service as a club?

Again, let me say State headquarters has been wonderful, and there is no criticism on them, and I, for one, want to do my duty, but I feel that instructions should be in plain English so that all draft boards can act alike.

I also think quotas should be fixed on a basis of registration and not on a basis of available class I-A men. By quotas being on available I-A men, the counties and districts where a board grants few deferments have to send a greater percent of men.

I am hoping that when Congress meets they face this problem squarely and bring things to a place where draft boards like us can really know what are regulations.

Your friend,

C. C. JONES,

Chairman, Henry County Local Board No. 1.

**Mr. WHEELER.** Here is a letter from Brooklyn, N. Y.:

After 3 years work as the chairman of a local selective service board, I have reviewed the files of thousands of registrants, spoken with them and with various members of their families and with many of their employers. I believe that most members of other boards have had similar experience.

In more recent months, our task has become more difficult since we have practically exhausted most available registrants for induction into the armed forces of the United States.

The problem of inducting pre-Pearl Harbor fathers has been a matter of serious concern to us. We have discussed the problem at great length and from all angles and particularly in face of our varied experience as a result of 3 years of service in selecting men for the armed forces we are familiar with the hardships encountered by various families and feel that it would not be unwise if Congress or its duly constituted committees would get the views of members of local boards, who are more directly in touch with the subject of selective service from the viewpoint of the registrant, than those who are at the head of selective service.

My own views and those other members of selective service local boards directly con-

nected with the selection of men for the induction into the armed forces and with whom I have discussed this matter, are that pre-Pearl Harbor fathers, if they must be selected for service, should be limited to service within the territorial jurisdiction of the United States, at least until such time as the heads of the various branches of our armed forces, in their good judgment deem it necessary to do otherwise, and thus avoid the hazards and risk that go with active duty overseas, since physical injury or death resulting in such service to pre-Pearl Harbor fathers would necessarily create greater hardships on a greater number by reason of the large families left behind.

They may be used to relieve the great number of physically fit men without dependents who are now extensively engaged throughout the United States in doing guard duty, m. p. duty and various other duties which are not strictly combatant work and who are less indispensable.

Much time, effort and expense is incurred in maintaining the morale of the home front. I believe that to deprive many a large family of its head and sufficient support, would seriously affect the morale of the home front.

Mr. President, why is it that the selective-service boards are resigning? They are the men, Mr. President, who have knowledge of what is going on in the United States. They know the men who are hiding behind industry. They are resigning because of their disgust.

Mr. President, a few days ago some Senators were saying they could not vote intelligently because they did not know the facts, and they wanted to get more information. How many of them are in the Senate at the present time willing to listen in order that they may get the facts? The truth is, they do not want the facts, or at least they do not act as if they wanted the facts. They are willing to let the administration crack the whip, and are willing to vote as the administration tells them to vote, regardless of the facts.

I now read a letter from Jackson Barracks, New Orleans:

I want to express my thanks to you for trying to put some sense in the draft laws.

At the present time the Army is releasing about 500,000 limited service men and at the same time asking for more men in the draft. It seems to me a waste of money and manpower to release trained men and at the same time drafting more new men.

I hope that the Congress will see fit to end the era of blank checks both in money and manpower that the military has been using so lavishly.

This comes from a private in the Army, and I shall not give his name, because I do not want him to get in trouble.

Now, I wish to read a statement from Houston, Tex. I am sorry the Texas Senators are not present to hear it. The statement is as follows:

Officials of many Houston war industries are guilty of labor hoarding; employing more men and women than they need to run their plants, Burr Pearson, manager of the United States Employment Service here, charged Thursday.

"Employers are holding a cushion in anticipation of a more stringent labor situation in the future," the United States Employment Service manager said. "If we knew how many workers are being hoarded and how many nonworking women are available to take jobs, we probably would have enough to man another shipyard."

"Of course, I have no proof of how much labor hoarding is going on, but I am certain there is a large amount of it."

Mr. Pearson made his statement after Claude E. Belk, area director of the War Manpower Commission, estimated 15,000 additional workers—10,000 of them women—would be needed in local industry in the next few months.

Mr. Pearson admitted that housing is scarce here to the extent where the city probably could not take care of any sizable net increase in the manpower field.

"But the war industries are experiencing a terrific turn-over, and the number of new workers coming to Houston each month is about the same as the number that leaves here for other war-production centers," he said.

Is it right to draft fathers in the face of statements of that kind?

I shall now read a letter from the wife of an officer in the Air Corps, and she states facts; this is not fiction. We have before us one of the most important questions facing the American people, facing not only 6,000,000 fathers, for they are not the only ones involved, but there are involved the children of these fathers, the mothers of the children, the grandparents, and their other relatives. Listen to what this lady says:

DEAR SIR: I am writing this because I am interested in the fight you have been waging for the sensible use of our manpower. My husband is an Army officer and the conditions I am going to mention are not unusual nor confined to the field located here. We have been in enough different places to say with truth that these same conditions are general throughout the camps and stations in this country.

This demonstrates efficiency, if you please, the businesslike operation we hear mentioned.

Here are some facts. The post engineers employ many young civilians who are supposed to be engineers. Here are two examples of work they have performed. One has charge of answering a telephone and dispatching trucks to different parts of the field, certainly a job a half-wit could perform. Another's job is to count the fire extinguishers, lamp shades, etc., whenever buildings are transferred from one organization to another. Civilians drive trucks all over the field accompanied by soldiers, who could drive, who point out the way.

Soldiers are sent along with the truck drivers to point out the way. The letter continues:

In Air Corps supply warehouse civilian help is almost entirely used though just a stone's throw away the Quartermaster Corps operates warehouses just as valuable with soldier help. Hundreds of civilians, some of them women, but many of them men, are engaged in many simple tasks which could be done by the hundreds of limited-service soldiers who are here for training they are unable to take. Although a company of WAC's is now on the field, there has been no cut of permanent personnel nor has there been any cut in the number of civilian employees. Thus you see that the addition of WAC's released no men for combat duty nor no civilians for war work. These facts are true throughout the Army Air Force and they should be brought forcibly to the attention of the citizens. I trust that you will trust my confidence and keep this letter secret because of my husband's position.

I have before me a letter from a professor in Connecticut College, in which he states:

This is to express my interest in your effort to secure legislation which would delay the drafting of fathers. (I am beyond draft age.)

In line with your contention that there is an adequate manpower if properly used, I would like to submit the following:

1. The Electric Boat Co., builder of submarines, is said to have more than 3,000 unmarried keymen which it manages to keep exempt from military service. The company is pretty well understood among people of the community to be a draft-dodger's paradise.

Some say to me, "You have not made out a case about these draft dodgers." How can I make out a case against these slackers except by submitting the evidence that is given to me by people from one end of the country to the other, not from crackpots, but from people such as this professor of the Connecticut College, who says:

Every man I know in the plant makes the flat assertion that the same number of submarines could be built with approximately half the present number of employees.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. HOLMAN. Last January I reported to the Senate Committee on Military Affairs my observation, while in the Oregon section of the country, of wastage of manpower and materials, and at my request the Truman committee sent out an investigator to ascertain the facts, to verify or disprove what I had reported. When the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] handed me the report of the investigator, for my confidential information, he remarked, "Senator HOLMAN, the situation is worse than you represented it to be." In spite of repeated attempts, I have not been able to have this report released and made available to the Senate and to the public.

Mr. WHEELER. Let me say in answer to the Senator from Oregon that Members of the Senate of the United States may not be interested in the subject. They may be more interested in some social function than they are in protecting the fathers of the United States. They may be more interested in following the lead of someone else than they are in taking some responsibility upon themselves. Some Members of the Senate say to me, "But I do not want to take this responsibility." I say to them, "What are you here for if not to assume responsibility? If you do not dare to assume the responsibility of acting to correct the waste and the extravagance which is now in effect in this country before you take fathers into the armed service, then you do not deserve to be in the Senate of the United States."

I shall read again the last sentence I read from the letter:

Every man I know in the plant makes the flat assertion that the same number of submarines could be built with approximately half the present number of employees. In spite of this, the company is now advertising for 2,000 more.

3. The last submarine launched at the company's victory yard was not accepted by the Navy, though it was supposedly built under close Navy supervision. This resulted in the loss of the Electric Boat Co.'s E, a

fact which has never been made public, and which even very few people in this area know.

The above information is supplied for whatever use you may wish to make of it. I have reason to believe that it is entirely reliable, all of it having come from men who work in the plant. These particular men are thoughtful and hard-working; they bear a grudge against no one, and hope some day to see the manpower problem handled efficiently. They, in common with the writer, deplore waste \* \* \* whether of time or materials.

Mr. President, in the face of such waste and extravagance it is asserted that married men, fathers, must be taken before such slackers are taken into the armed service. In the face of such waste and extravagance it is asserted that the taking of fathers cannot be deferred for 3 months until the whole manpower situation is investigated, and such slackers as those referred to in the letter I have just read are taken into the service. The Senate of the United States may not be interested in that situation, but the people of the United States are interested in it.

I read now from a copy of a letter written by the legislative representative of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen addressed to Mr. A. F. Whitney, president, Grand Lodge Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

DEAR BROTHER WHITNEY: I believe we should do all in our power to help Senator BERT WHEELER put through a law to do away with this 10-percent plus that the war industries are enjoying. The cost-plus 10 percent paid by our Government to these industries encourages them to waste \$1 to get another 10 cents in profit.

You have conditions in these war plants where men are idle—

Mr. President, this letter is not written by someone who hates labor; it is not written by a labor baiter. I continue to read from it:

You have conditions in these war plants where men are idle, in fact here in Buffalo I have spoken to a party, he claims that 16 men are employed to do the work 2 men could do with ease. I feel this information is reliable, as the source from whence it came is.

The work done by Curtiss-Wright and Bell Aircraft are very essential and the same, as they both make airplanes. But if this same amount of work can be done by at least 30 percent less manpower, by all means let's do it. These are just two of the many war plants here, the other plants are perhaps doing the same.

Lodge 224's membership of 700 are very interested in Senator WHEELER's effort to make this a law.

So, Mr. President, when I make complaint with respect to labor hoarding, I may say that it is based on complaints which I receive not from haters of labor but from labor unions themselves.

I shall now read from another letter addressed to me by a committee of the C. I. O., Chevrolet Local 659, International Union, United Automobile, Aircraft, and Agricultural Implement Workers of America:

DEAR SIR: We, the undersigned, a committee elected by the membership of Chevrolet Local, No. 659, U. A. W.-C. I. O., to investigate the rumors prevalent in the Flint Chev-

rolet plants that management has appointed mere boys (who are the sons of Chevrolet superintendents and other high officials) foremen for the sole purpose of enabling them to evade being inducted into the armed services.

After investigation, we find that unquestionably this has been done and that circumstances make it appear that there may have been collusion between certain corporations and the W. M. C. in this matter.

Sometime ago Major General Hershey stated publicly that the only thing that would drive the draft dodgers out of the plant was social indignation.

Waiting for social indignation to drive the draft dodgers out? Where is the power of this Government when it lets draft dodgers and slackers hide in war plants? Yet, in spite of that situation, it is desired to take fathers into the service, and, I repeat, put the little businessman out of business and drive him into overcrowded war plants. What is back of it? Do some of the new "brain trusters" want to put the little businessman out? Do they want to drive him into the big industries? Do they want only big industries to continue in operation because they feel that it would be easier to regulate them and take them over when the proper time comes? Is that the purpose of it? What other purpose could there be for what is now going on in the United States?

Mr. President, does anyone think for one moment that I am standing here placing my judgment against that of General Marshall? Some Members of the Senate say they do not want to assume the responsibility in the matter. The responsibility rests upon the administration and the bureaus involved, and when they will not assume it, when they will not exert the power they have, when they will not correct the situation that exists, then the people of the United States have only one recourse, and that is to appeal to their elected representatives in Congress; and if their elected representatives fail them, then government in the United States—in this democratic Republic—is gone, and, Mr. President, you know it and I know it.

I continue to read from the letter:

A short time ago, State Director of Selective Service Pearson stated that corporations who had requested deferment for certain employees had been given sufficient time to replace them and must do so at once.

A few days later management appointed these 22-year-old employees to foremanships, and almost immediately thereafter the W. M. C. issued a list of deferrable occupations, which included foremen in industry converted to war production.

I have here another letter from the C. I. O., Local No. 24, Aluminum Workers of America, Bridgeport, Conn., addressed to me:

DEAR SIR: We, the undersigned committee, duly appointed by Local Union No. 24, Aluminum Workers of America, to investigate discrimination in deferments, hereby request that you present the following evidence before the Military Affairs Committee:

We have been investigating deferments for several months, and we find that many single men, working in the United States Aluminum Co. plants in Bridgeport and Fairfield, including the magnesium plant, are given deferments, and married men were drafted.

We have also found that men working here came from other States, and were given indefinite deferments by their local boards.

We also found that officials of the Aluminum Co. have sons or relations who have been sent to the Fairfield and Bridgeport plants and placed in positions that could be classified as essential to the war effort. However, we find these men walking around with pads and pencils in their hands, or sitting at a typewriter. These men are single and should be drafted.

Yet there are those who would say, "Let this go on. Do not take the responsibility. Let it go on and on and on, and build up the supplies of such workers. We are going to take the fathers; we are going to take them out of their homes, by the backs of their necks, and throw their children into the streets."

Shame on anyone who takes that position.

I read further from the letter:

We would also recommend that Congress make it compulsory that a committee be appointed in each plant to work in conjunction with management relative to requests for deferments, and making up of replacement schedules.

Mr. President, the deferments are allowed to go on and on, for 6 months, just so long as the company says, "We must have them; we cannot replace them."

I read further from the letter:

We also find that many men who are single have had five or six deferments, and many married men are refused deferments.

We believe that 200 to 275 single men could be taken from these plants. This does not include marriages before Pearl Harbor. Hardship cases are rarely given consideration by local boards. We have a case of James Lewis Martino, order No. 1633, local board 8B, New Haven, Conn. He is a core maker; married November 27, 1941. He was told by his local board that he could not appeal, as he was going in October. We are contacting State selective service headquarters for a deferment. The United States Aluminum Co. has applied for a deferment and it was denied. Refusing the man the right to appeal is a violation of the Selective Service Act.

We have complained to General Hershey about the discrimination in deferments, and were referred to the State selective service board at West Hartford, Conn. We contacted this board and they promised to investigate, but nothing has been done. The replacement schedules as submitted by employers are a joke. These schedules are made up and sent to State selective service headquarters by the employer, listing the names, etc., of employees, and when they can be released for service. This list, we believe, is unfair to the men, because it can be used to get rid of them, if management should consider them undesirable, regardless of experience.

We therefore suggest that drafting of married men is uncalled for at this time, and should be stopped.

If this committee can be of further assistance to you, we will be glad to furnish names of men, etc., for your information.

Here is another letter from a C. I. O. local. Mind you, Mr. President, one of the letters I have read is from Connecticut, one is from Flint, Mich., and the one I now read is from Rockford, Ill.:

DEAR SIR: Local 225, U. A. W.-C. I. O., Rockford, Ill., has had a committee appointed in the last several months which has protested the deferring of single men and the drafting of husbands and fathers. We feel that the

older men and women should replace the single men in industry so that all single men could be inducted into the armed services.

This committee wishes to commend you on your stand in regards to the drafting of married men.

We hope that you are successful in your coming bill in the Senate and would appreciate a copy of same if possible.

Continue your good work for victory, I remain,

Fraternally,

A. W. KEENE, JR.,

President, Local 225, U. A. W.-C. I. O.

Here is a letter which comes from a man who was an insurance-company agent:

DEAR SENATOR: I have been much interested in your efforts to prevent the drafting of fathers into the services, and hope you will keep up the fight, for under existing conditions I believe it would be a crime to resort to this, for it is certainly not necessary.

If you will investigate the conditions at the war plants I am sure you will find enough evidence to support your contention. I will give you some details now. Take my own case. I am the father of three sons, all in the service, so about 18 months ago, believing I should do something to help, I gave up my business which I had followed for 15 years, to work in the Elco Boat Works at Bayonne, N. J., building PT boats. I was under the mistaken impression that the idea was to build boats as fast as it could be done, but how mistaken I was.

The writer of the letter is a worker in the plant, a man who gave up his little business. He is not a labor baiter. As I have said, I have here a letter from the railroad brotherhoods, letters from various locals of the C. I. O., and I also have letters from soldiers, which I shall read to the Senate.

The letter continues:

They don't want this war to end; too many men there are getting good money, they want it to last just as long as possible.

Here is a plant that could and should turn out at least six PT boats per week, with the help and facilities they have there, it is a crime the way they work it. The most they have ever turned out is two and one-half per week. There are three men doing one man's job all the time, and when one tries to work he is disliked. I tried very hard to do my job but was always told to go easy; finally I got so fed up with it all, that I resigned about 2 weeks ago.

As I said, they had been turning out two and one-half boats per week, now they are changing the model. They knew 6 months ago they were going to do this, but did not do a thing about it till they reached the place where it was to be changed. Now all is stopped; they have not put a single boat into the water in 2 weeks, nor will they put one in for another 2 weeks. Yet they are advertising for all the help they can get, asking their employees to bring anybody they know can use tools down there and they will employ them, and this all being done when they already have at least twice as many workers as they can possibly use. Why?

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. HOLMAN. Will the Senator yield so as to permit me to quote at this point in his remarks an 8-line stanza which I think apropos of the manpower-wastage situation?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. HOLMAN. I am informed that the stanza was composed in desperate earnestness by a marine in combat in the southwest Pacific area, under the general command of General MacArthur:

And if our lines should form, then break  
Because of things you failed to make—  
The extra tank, or ship, or plane—  
For which we waited all in vain  
And the supplies which never came  
Will you then come and take the blame?  
For we, not you, will pay the cost  
Of battles you, not we, have lost.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator.

The letter from which I was reading continues as follows:

And, by all the Gods, Senator, what is so complicated about a PT boat that it should cost one-quarter of a million dollars to build?

When I kicked about not having enough to do I was told to mind my own business, and now that I have left them they are so mad that they will not give me my release, so here I am, perfectly able and wanting to work, yet I have to sit home while they advertise in all the papers and radio to help the war effort by getting a job in a war plant, and also buy bonds. If it were not for my boys being in service I can tell you I would not buy a single bond, for they are just pouring money down the gutters of our fair country.

At this plant there are leadmen, commonly known as snappers, one for about every four persons, and the only thing they are used for is to hinder the men from working. I have seen more work stoppages and delays caused by snappers than from any one thing. Snappers indeed. On top of this is assistant foremen, then foremen galore, none of them doing a day's work, but all of them drawing down top money.

That is the result of the great number of cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts.

I read further from the letter:

I could tell lots more but cannot write it, but hope you will see that this situation is remedied, and that when you have investigated, it will, I am sure, be found that at these plants they have scores of men who could be spared who are not fathers.

I read now from a letter from a worker at Baltimore, Md.:

Sm: I am a pipe fitter at the largest shipyard here. Put on your overalls, come in and see for yourself.

There are many, many young men there just to dodge Army. They stand around, do no work of value. Too many, by far.

Many Senators are opposed to delaying the drafting of fathers. They are opposed to passing my bill and to delaying the drafting of fathers for 3 months so that the situation can be cleared up before fathers are drafted, homes are broken up, and little businessmen are put out of business.

Here is a letter from Birmingham, Ala.:

I am chairman of local draft board No. 10 and have been since the inauguration of selective service in September 1940. Therefore, I am thoroughly familiar with its rules and regulations, and throughout the 3 years that I have served my reputation is that of giving very few deferments. I am on the other hand just as reluctant to induct the so-called fathers.

It occurred to me that perhaps you would be interested in having me tell you that I know it to be a fact, that there are numbers of boys in this section who should be called

for military service before the drafting of fathers. Only recently the State director of selective service in Alabama insisted that two young college students, who the draft board and appeals board both had classified I-A should be given deferred classifications and permitted to remain in college, but the State director evidently prefers the drafting of fathers before young college students. In my opinion, the two large colleges in this State are crowded with students hiding behind various artifices to evade military service.

The writer further states:

Do not let anyone make you believe that many draft boards cannot fill quotas for a long time if they will take men out of deferred classifications that are now in II-A and II-B and not necessary to the war effort.

Here is a letter from the pastor of the First Congregational Church at Braintree, Mass.:

Please continue your gallant fight to prevent drafting of fathers. Juvenile delinquency is already an alarming problem. We already have a large army.

The letter is signed by the pastor of the church.

Here is one from the Monroe Avenue Methodist Church of Rochester, N. Y.:

Please continue your fine American stand in preservation of the American family.

The very core of our American culture and industry is the American family. Moral and social principles are at a low ebb throughout our Nation. To reach further into the fabric of the American family and thus destroy another basic fiber from our homes will be fatal.

Here is one from a lawyer in San Antonio, Tex.:

I listened with much interest to your discussion of the manpower problem, as the same relates to the question of drafting fathers. There can be no doubt in the minds of right-thinking men that you are eminently correct in your position.

The sacrifices required of the people of this Nation, due to the war, are monumental. The consequences of the war, even if carried on with the greatest consideration with regard to the future, will be terrific, and, if great care is not exercised, they will be disastrous; that the effect upon the moral standards has been damaging, there can be no question, nor that the home life has been detrimentally affected.

Let me add, that you did not touch upon one material fact, unless it was covered by the category of men employed in Government bureaus, this fact is, we are told, that in the departments operated by the Army itself, and where civilians are employed, such as Kelley Field, Fort Sam Houston, and other places surrounding this city, where possibly 100,000 civilians are on Government pay rolls, that there is a tremendous waste of manpower. I have been told by people so employed, that one-third of the personnel could be discharged without loss of production; in fact, that the efficiency would be largely increased by so doing.

Here is one from the Franciscan Fathers:

We heard with much interest your radio address and we pray that you will be successful against the diabolical forces who are trying to wreck our American, nay, Christian, institution of the home. We shudder to think of the responsibility these men are willing to assume in order to further their own selfish aims. God save our fathers and thereby protect our homes.

May God bless you and your noble work. Let us pray for a more Christian America.

Here is one from the local selective service board at Strawberry Plains, Tenn.:

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM,  
LOCAL BOARD NO. 1, JEFFERSON COUNTY,  
Strawberry Plains, Tenn.,  
September 25, 1943.

Senator BURTON K. WHEELER,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WHEELER: I listened to your address last night, and I wish to advise that I agree with you 100 percent.

I am 44 years old, and have been the chief clerk for Local Board No. 1 of Jefferson County, Tenn., for the past 3 years. During this time I have seen many men rejected at Fort Oglethorpe who immediately returned home and secured positions in industry, which positions required strenuous physical labor. I have also seen deferments claimed for single men without dependents for 3 years, with the company claiming the deferments apparently making no effort to replace these men. These men were not skilled workers, as they had only a high-school education and had been employed as apprentices, and deferment was claimed for them while they were serving as apprentices.

While you did not mention the replacement schedules filed by industries, I wish to advise that this board has learned the following from dealing with the replacement schedules:

A company will state that they will release a certain single man, or a married registrant without children, on a certain date, say, on September 1, 1941, and when that date arrives they will file a supplementary replacement schedule, and the Selective Service Headquarters will accept same, and they will then ask for these same men to be deferred for another 6 months. If the local board does not agree with industry, the Director of Selective Service will take an appeal, and the board of appeal will place the registrant in class II-B for another 6 months.

I wish to also call to your attention the fact that when a registrant is released by a company on a replacement schedule, before a draft board can give him all the necessary notices about the reopening of his classification, 5 days notice to appear for physical examination, and 10 days to appeal his classification, the registrant will secure employment with another company, and they will claim deferment on him. When a registrant follows this procedure, it is impossible for a draft board to get him in the Army, as the new employer will put him on a replacement schedule, and he will stay with them until he is released for military service and then secure employment with another concern. Cases such as this have happened several times with this local board.

This local board has had registrants leave their jobs after they have been placed in I-A, and go to shipyards, airplane factories, and the like, and these companies would employ them and claim deferment on them. If the 10 days allowed for appeal had expired, they would write the State director of selective service, and he would request the local board to reopen the case.

While you did not mention deferments in agriculture, I wish to advise that this board has approximately 175 men deferred in agriculture, and, to the best of my knowledge, I do not believe that there are 10 tenant single men that the farm owners have claimed deferments for; however, it seems that every farmer that has a son wishes to get rid of his tenant farmers in order to claim deferment for the son. The Army has released several men for farming, to my personal knowledge, and that, to my personal knowledge, these soldiers who were released were not engaged in farming at the time of their induction or enlistment.

This local board is faced with the situation of drafting fathers when there are single men who have been deferred in industry for 3 years; single men deferred in agriculture that this board did not think had sufficient production and refused to classify in class II-C, but who appealed to the board of appeal and were placed in class II-C as necessary men, although their production did not equal 10 units per worker on the farm.

All the statements made above are facts, and you can use them in any way you see fit, and I will be glad to point out to you or any other person the cases as outlined above.

That is the same story that I get from one end of the country to the other.

In the face of those facts, it is proposed to take fathers, without investigating these cases. We do not want to take 3 months' time to investigate them.

It is said, "You are creating a crisis." Bless my soul! We have had nothing but crises from 1932 to the present moment. We are now facing a real crisis. We are facing the crisis of whether we shall break up the American home. We are facing the crisis of whether we shall destroy democracy in this country while it is said we are fighting for the "four freedoms" across the water.

This summer a very reputable gentleman told me that he had talked with a Russian officer. I will not state the particular place at which the conversation occurred, but I know where it was. Allow me to say that my informant is a very reputable man. He said, "This Russian officer who was here this summer said to me, 'I do not see very much difference between your government and ours. The only difference I see is that we shoot men for inefficiency. We call it sabotage. You promote them.'"

Here is a letter from Pueblo, Colo. It states in part as follows:

Am sending you a clipping taken from the "Open forum" column of the Denver Post.

"Why draft fathers when soldiers loaf?" is the title of the clipping to which the letter refers. The clipping reads as follows:

To the Open Forum:

We represent a group of permanent party soldiers here in Denver who read recently an item in the Denver Post under the headline: "Find a war job or fight." This was addressed to married men. Now three of us are married and have children and we enlisted in the Army to do just that—to fight. Most of us have been here since we enlisted. Now, why should any man who is married be inducted into the Army just to hang around Lowry Field or any other Army base for the duration of the war?

Before the drafting of married men, especially fathers, is carried out why is it not first advocated sending overseas the men who are already in the Army and are only too anxious to go over there and fight?

Pvt. (1st cl.) ROBERT E. DALY.

Sgt. H. L. STEINBOCK.

Staff Sgt. GUY SWANNEY.

Staff Sgt. WILLIAM BONNER.

LOWRY FIELD.

Here are four men, three of whom are married and have children, who read the article "Find a War Job or Fight." They enlisted in the Army to fight. They now say in effect, "We are lying around the field with nothing to do."

Here is a letter from an engineering contractor. It is from Los Angeles, Calif., and reads in part as follows:

Your statement that a considerable amount of the defense-plant labor is wasted is absolutely true, but I doubt if your statements are strong enough.

I am a successful contractor, 64 years of age, with 40 years' construction experience. A registered Democrat.

For 6 months I worked in and along Lockheed and Vega aircraft plants and observed the way a lot of their employees wasted their time.

I also picked up a lot of the employees going to and from work, and the majority of them would brag as to what a small amount of work they did that day. Several times young men and their wives—both working in the same plant—would discuss what they had done all day, and invariably they would comment as to how little they had actually produced.

A man told me this morning that his son-in-law is employed by one of the plants as an expert, drawing over \$600 a month, but he has not done a particle of work for over 6 weeks. He reports daily at the plant, then goes back home for the rest of the day.

As to the shipyards.

A construction superintendent who worked for us several years is now employed at one of the local shipyards. He made this statement to me: "It is a crime the way the men loaf on the job. If you had a contract for these ships, you would fire over one-third of the men and then get more work done." He has also stated that he knows he could do the work of four men, the way the average employee worked.

He thinks 10 percent of the men do not actually work over an hour a day, 25 percent do not work over 2 hours a day, and not over 25 percent actually try to produce.

What few that do try to earn their wages are continually "ribbed" by the loafers.

The cure for this inefficiency is to put the defense plants on a straight contract basis.

You may rest assured if this is done the man shortage will be relieved considerably as the plants will then lay off the "drones."

I hope you succeed in your efforts to defer pre-Pearl Harbor fathers as there will be plenty of orphans and dependents after this war.

Mr. President, that is the kind of reports which I receive.

Senators may go into any community in my State, I care not where, and they will see men such as carpenters and others who had been employed in defense and became so thoroughly disgusted that they returned to their homes. They will state that thousands upon thousands of men are employed in those plants. Last Saturday a man in the War Department said to me, "We sent a very well-known and very prominent man out to visit and inspect one of the war plants. He came back and said that everybody was working there." The man in the War Department then said to me, "I talked to some of the workers and they told me how the management put it over on the man who came to visit the plant." He said they told him they had not been working for several days, but when they knew the visitor was coming there the management shot the workers in to do some work.

I received a letter from a very prominent man in my State giving me similar information with reference to what was taking place in some of the plants engaged in defense work in my home State of Montana where first-class efficient employees were lying around with nothing to do. The men cannot be blamed when the industry itself, because of war

contracts on a cost-plus-fixed-fee basis, are employing large numbers of men for whom there is no work. We cannot blame the men. It is human nature. Many of them have said that they have a softer job than they had on W. P. A. and God knows that was soft enough for most of them. Who is to blame for it? Is the Congress of the United States to blame for it? Are fathers to blame for it? Are their children to blame for it? Who is to blame for it? The blame rests right here in the city of Washington. It rests right on the heads of various departments.

The assertion is often made, "You ought to go along with the administration; surely you desire unity." Certainly that would imply that I and all of us should simply permit this waste and inefficiency to continue to go on, and we ought to keep our mouths shut. We should not say anything because we ought to trust these departments. We ought to let the military service take fathers and break up homes. Well, others may do so but I am not going to do it. Others may do it because they have read headlines and editorials in some of the newspapers, the writers of which did not know or have the facts, and do not have them today. Let me say that Mr. Baruch did not have the facts; he could not have had the facts; Mr. Byrnes has not the facts, and no other heads of the departments have them. Mr. Baruch has done everything he could, and I think Mr. Byrnes is trying to do all he can; but what they ought to do is to dismiss some of the heads of the departments who have let these contracts; they ought to kick them out because of inefficiency and incompetence.

The War Manpower Commission admits 5-percent waste in manpower utilization; yet they, who have permitted this waste to go on, say it is necessary to draft fathers and break up homes. Does that make sense to anybody? We are told we must not vote to stop it; that we must vote to let it go on.

I read from an article by Ben W. Gilbert in the Washington Post:

War Manpower Commission officials yesterday frankly admitted that the country's labor could be used 25 percent more effectively than at present.

Here is a letter from Birmingham, Ala.—and I am sorry the Senators from Alabama are not present. The writer of the letter says:

My work carries me on many trips throughout the State of Alabama. I can assure you that in large cities and small villages, not only the pre-Pearl Harbor fathers but every citizen who can think two jumps ahead of the present hour, heartily endorses your fight to ban the drafting of heads of families.

In the event that the Army and Navy chieftains prevail, and it does become necessary to call us fathers to service, can't some provision be made to have the calls made in order of number of dependents, instead of by draft number? It appears obvious that the draft of a father with one child will in the great majority of cases work less hardship on innocent parties than will the drafting of a man who must leave a wife with two, three, or four children. And it does seem so pointless to have a man leave a family and three or four children while a father with one child in similar financial circumstances stays home, merely because the Goddess of Chance smiled

upon him when the order numbers were drawn in this draft lottery.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. Has the Senator at hand and does he intend to place in the Record the Gallup poll on this issue?

Mr. WHEELER. I have not got it, but I understand that it showed, before any facts were brought out, that 66 percent were against drafting fathers.

Mr. DOWNEY. I may say to the distinguished Senator I think it was even stronger than that. I think about 75 percent of those who expressed an opinion, or 68 percent of the total number who were interviewed, were opposed to drafting fathers. A substantial minority did not express any opinion.

I should like to make a further comment. I have not a copy of the poll, but I think it ought to be placed in the Record, because, in my opinion, it is a clear indication that in the villages and cities of America where men are talking to their own boys in the service and know what men are doing in factories and on the farms, out there where the facts are known, our people know there is no excuse for the drafting of fathers. I think the Gallup poll should be in the Record.

Mr. WHEELER. I thank the Senator. I do not know whether we have it or not.

Mr. DOWNEY. If the Senator will further yield, I inquire if he would like to have a quorum called?

Mr. WHEELER. No, not just now.

Mr. DOWNEY. The Senator has been talking for quite awhile.

Mr. WHEELER. Here is a letter from Dallas, Tex., in which the writer says:

Your heroic fight to preserve the United States of America, with its institutions and traditions, has caused many people to think, and to remain uninfluenced by fine phrases, promises, and threats.

He says further:

The writer realizes well that the General Staff and the War Department must have a free hand in the strategical and tactical battle plans. This policy is in no way related to such plan, and seems to be a mere whim of the War Department and General Staff to satisfy those who seek quick and frequent promotion. I would not ask you to interfere in the movement of troops or ships, or to have you suggest at which point our armed forces should strike. But I do feel that the personnel policies of the War Department—the relieving of these officers being only one—are not in the best interests of our country.

Hoping you can make your views heard in this matter, as you have made them heard in many other matters, I am—

Here is a letter from Indianapolis, Ind., written by the clerk of the city court, who says:

In my position as city clerk I come in contact with many people and naturally hear expressions of opinion on subjects of national interest. I am taking this opportunity to pass on to you a few observations obtained from discussion on the subject of selective service as it applies to drafting of fathers which is now being considered by Congress.

The consensus of opinion seems to be the shortage of manpower, both in the armed forces and in defense industries is not due so much to the failure to draft fathers but the failure on the part of the Selective Service Bureau and the War Manpower Commis-

sion to coordinate their forces to their full extent.

He goes on to say:

The percentage of rejections and returns to civilian life in the bracket over 30 is now very large. It would undoubtedly be much larger if fathers were drafted.

In this connection let me call the attention of the Senate to the fact that there are in this country today over 3,000,000 men in the IV-F classification. Of that number the Army is taking 5 percent, and, according to all the reports I get, it is constantly releasing IV-F men after they have been taken into the service. These men are returning to civil life and are going to work in various industries in positions which require strong, husky men.

Mind you, Mr. President, Russia, as everyone admits, has one of the best fighting forces in the world today. They have demonstrated that fact. I called the Russian Embassy and asked them what Russia's requirements were as to age and physical fitness. They said that from the northern part of their country the Russian Army takes men up to 50 years of age. In the southern section of the country the Russian Army does not take men up to 50 generally, because they are not so strong and so healthy and husky as those in the north.

Mr. President, there have been released from the service 275,000 men who are between the ages of 38 and 45, who passed every test given them by the local doctors and then by the Army, and who were inducted into the service. They have been discharged after having been given a year's training. Those are not my figures; they are the figures of the Army.

Now fathers are to be called. While the 275,000 men are not capable probably of undergoing severe training, yet the Army says that it is necessary to have one-third of those in the Army do what is called housekeeping work.

Mr. McNutt has been very severely criticised and General Hershey has been blamed for many things. Let me call attention to the fact that General Hershey stated that if the military services would reduce their standards and take some of the men from IV-F, they could get 2,000,000 more men for the Army and Navy.

I dare say Senators think that the British have a pretty good navy. The British boast of the fact, and everyone admits that the British have a pretty good navy. I called up the British Embassy and asked them for some figures, and I received a letter, from which I read:

MY DEAR MR. SENATOR: I am sorry not to have been able to send you sooner the particulars about the physical standards in the British services for which you asked, but we have very little on the subject here and what we have is not very accessible.

Royal Navy: Neither before the war nor now were there any rigid physical standards laid down. Before the war the standard actually applied varied according to the supply of and demand for recruits. Today any man in a reasonable physical condition is accepted for general service on the principle that he can be fitted in somewhere. Certain physical standards are laid down for specific duties, such as aviation or the sub-

marine service, and I understand that these are roughly comparable with those in force by the United States Navy. Men suffering from curable diseases are accepted and are treated after admission to the service. Only in tubercular cases are the standards quite uncompromising. The general principle is that if a man has been released for war service he can be fitted in somewhere, the substandard relieving a better man for a more active job.

Mr. President, if our Army and Navy would follow that principle there would be no excuse for taking the fathers of this country into the armed services. Yet we are letting many husky young men leave the Army and Navy day after day.

I might say that I went to my office Sunday to open the mail because I did not want it so cluttered up when we resumed our session in the Senate. One of my clerks was there helping me, and we worked from half-past 3 in the afternoon until 9 o'clock at night just opening the mail that came in upon the subject I am now discussing.

While I was in the office two men called me up, one from my home State, and one from the State of Louisiana. One of these men can speak English, Spanish, French, and German. He had been a school teacher when he enlisted in the Army. He wished to get an officer's commission, and the Army sent him around from pillar to post, and finally he wound up in Richmond, where they let him out because, they said, he had a slight defect in one of his eyes. He told me he never knew that he had a defect, but he stated that he could read perfectly without glasses. This young man said, "I am going to Canada and enlist in the Canadian Army, because I want to get into the war."

A man from my State also came to my office. He has been in the Army, and has been under training for nearly 2 years, but they are discharging him because he had been treated in the hospital for some slight disorder of the stomach. He said, "I am perfectly capable of going on and doing the kind of work I am doing now. I am not capable of going out into combat service or taking hard physical training, but I am perfectly capable of doing the work I am now performing." I think he has been stationed at Pittsburgh.

A very well known businessman of this city said to me Sunday morning, "You are absolutely right in the position you take. I have two sons in the Army. One of them is a big boy, who stands 6 feet 2, who could play baseball or football or any other game, but they were about to discharge him from the Army because it was said he had some physical defect. He wanted to stay in; so I went down and insisted and made a fight to have him stay in. The authorities finally had a board in Washington pass upon him, and the board said he was perfectly sound physically."

Mr. President, it is not a question between General Marshall and me; the question is, Do gentlemen want to be governed by the facts, or do they want to let people lead them around by the nose in order that the authorities may drive fathers into industry regardless of whether they should go into industry or not?

The letter from the British Embassy continues:

Army: The position here is rather more complicated. Before the war there were certain definite standards of height, age, chest measurement, etc. I am enclosing a copy of the Regulations, and you will find these standards given on pages 73 to 76. The principle today is rather different. The old standards have been given up, and men who are released for service are graded into a number of categories according to their physical fitness. I am enclosing a statement giving these categories and some particulars about them. Would you be so kind as to return to me these papers and the booklet of Regulations, as these are the only copies we have here?

I hope this gives you the information you wanted.

Believe me,

Very sincerely yours,

Maj. J. G. LOCKHART,  
Private Secretary.

Mr. President, what are some of these categories? I read from the data furnished me by the British Embassy:

(1) Army category	(2) Army standard as regards physique and capabilities	(3) Locality in which men may normally be employed
A.1	See to shoot or drive. Can undergo severe strain without defects of locomotion, with only minor (remediable) disabilities.	Any area in a theater of war.
A.2	See to shoot or drive. Can undergo severe strain with slight defects of locomotion, with only minor (remediable) disabilities.	Do.
A.3	See to drive. Can undergo severe strain with or without slight defects of locomotion, with only minor (remediable) disabilities.	Do.
B.1	See to shoot or drive. Can undergo considerable exertion not involving severe strain without defects of locomotion, with moderate degree of disabilities.	L. of C., base or garrison service at home or abroad.
B.2	See to shoot or drive. Can undergo considerable exertion not involving severe strain, with defects of locomotion, with moderate degree of disabilities.	Do.
B.2a	See to drive. Can undergo considerable exertion not involving severe strain, with or without slight defects of locomotion, with moderate degree of disabilities.	Do.
B.3	See for ordinary purposes but not shooting or driving. Can undergo severe strain without defects of locomotion, with only minor (remediable) disabilities.	Do.
B.4	See for ordinary purposes but not shooting or driving. Can undergo severe strain with slight defects of locomotion, with only minor (remediable) disabilities.	Do.
B.5	See for ordinary purposes but not shooting or driving. Can undergo considerable exertion not involving severe strain with or without defects of locomotion, with moderate degree of disabilities.	Do.
B.6	Physique and standard of vision are good enough for a higher category but the man is placed in this category because of defective (standard 3) hearing.	Do.
C	Standard of vision is good enough for a higher category but the man is placed in this category because of marked defects of locomotion or marked physical disabilities or evidence of past disease, or combinations of these.	Home service only.

Mr. President, compare those with our standards. If we should lower our standards in a comparatively slight degree we would not have to take blind men or deaf men, but if we would lower the standards of the Army and Navy, as General Hershey stated, we could get 2,000,000 more men out of class IV-F.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUCAS in the chair). Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I do not like to interrupt the Senator's speech.

Mr. WHEELER. That is all right.

Mr. HILL. The Senator has repeated two or three times that General Hershey said that 2,000,000 men could be obtained from class IV-F.

Mr. WHEELER. That is correct.

Mr. HILL. On the basis of General Hershey's statement to the effect, as the Senator from Montana has said, that 2,000,000 men could be obtained from class IV-F, one could just as well say that 3,000,000 men could be obtained from class IV-F, because there are 3,000,000 men in IV-F.

Mr. President, I have before me part 2 of the hearings before the Committee on Military Affairs of September 15, 16, and 17, 1943. On page 190 of the hearings let us see just what General Hershey did say. General Hershey was testifying.

Senator WHEELER. The next question I wanted to ask you was: If these standards were lowered—

The Senator was talking about physical standards; if the physical standards were lowered.

Mr. WHEELER. That is correct.

Mr. HILL. I read:

If these standards were lowered and a full check was made of the available single men in this country, and if the Army and Navy standards were lowered to take in some of the classifications you have named today, you would not have to take married men at least for a long time, would you?

General HERSHEY. That is right. We have 3,000,000 men, approximately, in IV-F, or a little more. If you could lower the standards to the place where you could take 2,000,000 of them, obviously you would put it off.

Mr. WHEELER. That is correct.

Mr. HILL. Of course that would result in putting off the drafting of married men. But that does not mean that General Hershey was advocating that we should go into class IV-F and take physically disqualified and disabled men. If it were desired to take all the men who have been disqualified for physical disabilities we could take 3,000,000 men, including one-legged men, one-eyed men, tubercular men, and men with all sorts of physical disabilities.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I have not at any time contended that General Hershey advocated that such a course be followed, but what I shall say now, in view of the fact that the Senator from Alabama has brought up the question, is that Commissioner McNutt has advocated to the Army, and so has General

Hershey, that the physical standards be lowered by the Army.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Montana is exactly correct in his statement. Governor McNutt and General Hershey both said that they had talked with Army officials, and I will even use the word "argued"—that they had perhaps argued with the Army officials and Navy officials about both branches lowering their physical standards.

Mr. WHEELER. Yes.

Mr. HILL. But let us see what General Hershey has to say about that. I have before me his testimony appearing on the same page from which I have just read, page 190. The Senator from Montana was interrogating General Hershey.

Senator WHEELER. As he said—

The Senator from Montana in his question has reference to Governor McNutt—

As he said, he or his War Manpower Board has disagreed with the Army and Navy with reference to the standards which they have had, because it did disturb or interfere with them getting the necessary single men and the married men without children.

General HERSHEY. That is correct. The procurement man must try, if he can, to sell what he has on hand. It is my business to sell every last man that the Army and Navy can possibly use.

Senator WHEELER. You have tried to the best of your ability to do that, but the Army and Navy have disagreed with you with reference to that.

General HERSHEY. They have come down some, but obviously they have not come down to the seller's market yet.

Senator WHEELER. They have not come down to the point where you think they should come down as a seller?

General HERSHEY. As a seller, I will try to sell every available man.

Senator WHEELER. I think you are doing the right thing. Not only that, but I think when you are doing that you are doing something that the country will thoroughly approve of before you take married men with children, because if anybody has seen the mail that is coming to me, there is no question at all but what the overwhelming majority of the people of this country, in my judgment—some of the Senators may disagree with me—but what the overwhelming majority of the people of this country is opposed to taking these fathers and breaking up the American home until all the other available people are taken into the Army and Navy.

Senator HILL. General, you spoke about being a salesman and selling your product. If you were a division commander at the front, you would be in a different position, would you not?

General HERSHEY. Obviously.

Senator HILL. And your views might be entirely different?

General HERSHEY. There is no question about that. If I were a battery commander, I probably would not want these people, but I am not a battery commander today.

Senator HILL. You are trying to sell your product?

General HERSHEY. Yes, sir; I am trying to sell my product.

Mr. HILL. Then General Hershey continued:

Yes. I tried to get people that I thought would actually stop that—

That is, stop drafting married men—

On the other hand, if General White—

General White is Assistant Chief of Staff, G-1 (personnel), War Department General Staff—

If General White would come to me and say, "If you were a member of my division, what would you advise me on this?" obviously my advice would have to be different because it is a different viewpoint.

General Hershey said he was speaking as a salesman, and was trying to get the Army and the Navy to take all they could.

Mr. WHEELER. Of course. That is exactly what I have been saying. There is no dispute about that matter. General Hershey and Mr. McNutt both stated that they felt the Army and the Navy should lower their physical standards.

Mr. President, Col. J. E. Nelson, State director, Selective Service System, Minnesota, appeared before the committee and said that the armed services had from time to time changed the physical standards, and complained bitterly with respect to the way the local boards had to handle the manpower situation in view of the changes which were made from time to time. Here is his testimony:

Colonel NELSON. I might say, to begin with, that the local boards are constantly combing over the IV-F's, and as new changes are made by the Army, as far as standards are concerned, we at our board have a medical officer and it is his job to work in conjunction with the local board, to see that those standards are followed by the local board.

Senator WHEELER. How many times do they change the standards?

Colonel NELSON. Senator, I believe, roughly, we have had standards changed around six to eight times.

Senator WHEELER. That is what I understood, that they changed the standards six or eight times. That has been of itself extremely confusing to many of the local boards.

Colonel NELSON. That is true, but the change in standards is almost immediately reflected by the local board, because their efforts may be in that direction. They realize there is a lot of manpower in there, or they feel there is a lot of manpower in that group that ought to be in the armed forces, and they are very anxious to get them out.

Mr. President, what is true of the draft boards in Minnesota is true with respect to practically every one of the draft boards throughout the United States. Who knows best the conditions which exist in a State? We have on the local draft boards responsible men, who have been picked because they are substantial citizens in their particular communities. Yet from time to time they are resigning their jobs. A few moments ago, in the absence of the junior Senator from Alabama, I read a letter from a local draft board in the State of Alabama. The writer complained with respect to what was happening in the great State of Alabama concerning single men and fathers.

I continue to read from the statement of Colonel Nelson:

Senator WHEELER. I know in my State many of the local boards were extremely confused. They hated to send a man up and then when he was turned back to send him up again. They said they would change so

often it meant they would have to keep calling this man up and sending him over there. They just did not like to be calling the fellow up and sending him over and having him come back and then sending him over again, because it upset his business, it upset him, it had a very confusing effect not only upon the man himself but upon the industry, upon the businessmen, and everybody else.

Colonel NELSON. Both confusing and embarrassing.

Senator BARKLEY. As to these six or eight changes in the standards that you speak of, were they made with the view of increasing the men drawn into the service from the pool, or were they made with the view of making it more difficult to get them in?

Colonel NELSON. I believe the Army ought to answer that, but I would say offhand, from the administration of the selective-service standpoint, that it works both ways. Some have been in the interest of getting more manpower for the armed forces, and others have been as the result, in all probability, of the difficulties they encountered in the service through certain physical deficiencies, and, therefore, it was necessary to change the standards.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The Senator has referred to Colonel Nelson, of Minnesota. General Hershey described himself as a national salesman, and just as General Hershey is a national salesman, so, to use General Hershey's expression, Colonel Nelson is the salesman in the State of Minnesota. Colonel Nelson makes it clear that even if some men could be squeezed out from the physically disabled group in class 4-F, and some additional men could be picked up here and there, still it would be necessary to draft fathers.

On page 151 of Colonel Nelson's testimony the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] asked the following question of Colonel Nelson:

I should like to ask you whether, as director of the selective service of Minnesota, you would be able to fill the quotas without drafting the fathers that are involved in this bill?

Colonel NELSON. I would say "Decidedly no." We have approximately 8 percent of our registrants that are in 4-F.

Of course, as we know, the men in 4-F are the men who have been rejected because of physical disability.

Colonel Nelson then said:

We have approximately 450,000 registrants from 18 to 38. Therefore, there are roughly around 36,000 or 37,000 in that classification.

Meaning the men in the 4-F physical-disability classification.

While we feel, if the Army and Navy would reduce their standards to some degree, we could produce probably a small fraction of that number for service in the armed forces, that it would be helpful in lowering the number of fathers we should ultimately have to call.

Senator BARKLEY. In other words, then, if I understand you, in your State, after you have rescinded—

That is, after the men in the physical-disability class have been reexamined, and after just as many of them as possible have been squeezed out of that class—

all those who are in the other categories, whether illiterates, defectives, or any other categories, after you have taken in all those you expect to take in, you still are required to induct fathers in order to meet the quota?

Colonel NELSON. If the armed forces remain steadfast in what they must have in the forces, I see no other alternative.

No other alternative than to draft fathers.

Mr. WHEELER. Of course, Mr. President; but that testimony does not change the situation in the slightest degree, because Colonel Nelson went on to say how the men in his State are healthier and stronger. But the distinguished junior Senator from Alabama talks about these men being silly. The men take an examination. Those who give the examination know the men from their own communities. They see them and understand them and feel that they should be in the Army. They see them go to the various induction centers, for instance to the one at Missoula, Mont., and then learn that sometimes 30 percent of those who have taken the first examination have been sent back, after having traveled 300 or 400 miles. I have seen that happen in own State time and time again. I have seen instance after instance of men who have been rejected subsequently going to work on the railroads or in factories, and demonstrating that they are just as strong as men in the services.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Colonel Nelson in his testimony takes the position that, although the Army and the Navy do not take some men who should be taken, even if such men were taken the Army and the Navy would not be able to reduce materially the number of fathers who ultimately must be taken.

Furthermore, let me say that the inductee receives only a cursory examination at the hands of the Selective Service. He does not get a really thorough or complete examination until he arrives at the induction center, where the examination is given by the Army.

Mr. WHEELER. The inductees certainly are given more than a cursory examination when they are sent to Missoula, Mont. I submit one can go into any local community in the country and can obtain the facts and will find men who have been rejected at the induction centers but who are good, strong, husky men.

Of course, the total number of fathers involved, according to the general, is 446,000. If from the more than 3,000,000 men in class IV-F it is impossible to obtain a sufficient number of men to take the places of some of those who are needed in the combat service, when one-third of the Army will not be in combat service but will be doing housekeeping work, as the Army terms it, or work in the Services of Supply, or work in guarding bridges, then something is radically wrong.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I shall suggest one instance, which possibly can be multiplied many thousand times, of what the Senator from Montana has in mind. I know of a young man in my State who is in as good physical condition as possibly any young man in the Army. He is unmarried; but early in life, when he was 2 or 3 years of age, he had the unfortunate experience of having a small, two-by-four operation on his jaw, and he has a little disfigurement in his lower jaw. Aside from that disfigurement, he is in perfect condition. His heart, his lungs, his whole physical make-up are in perfect condition. Not only that, but he is very well trained. However, he is working for one of the agencies of the Federal Government because he cannot fit into the Army.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I realize how easy it is for any of us, I suppose, to see or hear of some individual case and then multiply it by any number of multiples which we may imagine would fit the situation. The Senator from Montana spoke about the sending of men to Missoula to be examined. I presume that is the induction point.

Mr. WHEELER. It was. I think perhaps it has since been changed.

Mr. BARKLEY. They had gone through what the Senator from Alabama called a cursory examination by the draft board in the county; is that correct?

Mr. WHEELER. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. And then they were sent to Missoula for induction. The Senator from Montana says that many of those men who were rejected and who came back home, were physically strong and able to be in the Army, and that subsequently they worked on the railroad tracks or engaged in other labor. How does the Senator know that of his own knowledge?

Mr. WHEELER. How do I know that?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. WHEELER. Because I have seen it with my own eyes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Let me ask the Senator about that. The Senator was not at Missoula, and did not see the men examined there, I presume?

Mr. WHEELER. No; but I have seen the men who came back.

Mr. BARKLEY. Did the Senator see them working on railroad tracks?

Mr. WHEELER. I did not see them working on railroad tracks, but I have seen them.

Mr. BARKLEY. But the Senator mentioned railroad tracks.

Mr. WHEELER. It is not a question of my seeing each and every one of them, because I do not imagine the Senator from Kentucky is able to see all the people of Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. No; and I am not going to imagine the condition of all the people of Kentucky whom I cannot see.

Mr. WHEELER. That is not necessary; but in many instances I have talked to the boys, and have talked to those in the services. If for one moment the

Senator does not believe what I am saying, let him go into his own State or into any other State of the Union, and he will find that the facts I am stating will be confirmed.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have serious doubt about whether it would be possible to go into any or all the States and to have confirmed the statements the Senator has made as facts. I am sure the Senator is serious in stating his belief of whatever the facts may be; but there are not enough Regular Army physicians to examine all the men. Many of the physicians, now in the Army, who examined the men are physicians who, until the war, had been in civilian life and in civilian practice. They do the best they can to pass upon the physical fitness of the men they examine, in accordance with the regulations and the standards fixed by the Army. They have to do that. It may be that now and then they reject some one about whom they have doubt, some one who might turn out to be a good soldier. However, I do not think it is fair to indict all the doctors of the country who have gone into the Army and now are examining the men who may be drafted by saying that they reject from the Army men who may merely have some slight physical defect. Those doctors are just as sincere and honest and patriotic as the rest of the Army; and I do not think it is fair to speak as the Senator from Montana has spoken, of all the doctors who have gone into the Army service from the practice of civilian medicine.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, let me say it is perfectly ridiculous to make such a statement as that, because I have not said anything of the sort.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator has talked about the rejection of men by doctors, and they are rejected by doctors who have been taken from civilian life.

Mr. WHEELER. I understand that; but I do not intend to let the Senator from Kentucky put such words in my mouth.

Mr. BARKLEY. What did the Senator intend to infer? He spoke of the men being rejected.

Mr. WHEELER. Of course; but if the Senator had listened to what I have said this afternoon—

Mr. BARKLEY. I have listened to all of it, and I have read all the hearings at which I was not present. I was present at most of them.

Mr. WHEELER. What I said was that it is not the fault of the local doctors, but the fault lies in putting the men in Class IV-F.

Mr. BARKLEY. The men put in class IV-F were not necessarily put there by local doctors who were in the locality when the men came before the draft boards, but they were put in that class by Army doctors, most of whom were taken from local, civilian practice, as we all know.

Mr. WHEELER. Oh, no. The Senator is entirely mistaken.

Mr. BARKLEY. No one else could examine them.

Mr. WHEELER. They were examined in Missoula, Mont., by local doctors.

Mr. BARKLEY. Those doctors may have been local doctors, but I dare say that they were part of the Army staff of examiners.

Mr. WHEELER. They were not. The Senator does not know what he is talking about.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have a good example in following the Senator from Montana in that regard.

Mr. WHEELER. When the Senator makes such a statement, he is entirely mistaken.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am not talking about the local draft boards. The men at the induction centers are examined by doctors who are charged by the War Department with responsibility.

Mr. WHEELER. That is a different thing.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator is talking about Missoula. That is an induction point.

Mr. WHEELER. Let us get this matter straight. First, they were screened in a certain place. They were passed upon by the local doctors in the local community.

Mr. BARKLEY. That was before the draft board.

Mr. WHEELER. That was before the draft board. Then they were sent to Missoula, Mont.—

Mr. BARKLEY. Which is an induction point.

Mr. WHEELER. I do not know whether it can be called an induction point or not; but at that time doctors from Montana examined the men. The system may have changed.

Mr. BARKLEY. It would not be necessary to go outside Montana to obtain good doctors. However, they would conduct such examinations as a part of the Army examining board.

Mr. WHEELER. Exactly; but they were not in the Army. They were not Army officers.

Mr. BARKLEY. They are charged with moral responsibility.

Mr. WHEELER. But they are not Army doctors.

Mr. BARKLEY. They may not have been in uniform.

Mr. WHEELER. Those doctors, of course, were doing what they had to do because of the physical standards of the Army.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course; and any doctor who is charged by his Government with the responsibility of passing upon the physical qualifications of a man who is about to be inducted, whether the doctor has on a uniform or wears civilian clothes, is going to perform his duty to the best of his ability. I dare say that even the physicians who are in the Reserve, but who may be called upon to examine draftees, are just as conscientious in the performance of their duties as though they were in uniform.

The Senator may have unwittingly done so, but it seems to me that by his illustration he left certain unfair inferences. He stated that many drafted men had been sent to Missoula and examined there. Missoula is one of the larger cities in Montana, and it is a center where men come from the draft

boards. The Senator made the statement that many men who should have been kept in the Army were being sent home. Whether they were examined by local physicians or Army physicians, or by reserve physicians, it seems to me that to say that many of them who ought to have been kept in the Army were rejected is a reflection upon the skill and ability of the physicians who examined them. The Senator may well contend, as he has done all along, that the Army standards are too high. That is a matter which is, of course, subject to debate; but I would not be willing to substitute my judgment or the judgment of Congress as to the physical standards of the men who are to do the fighting, for that of the Army and Navy. We must leave the decision of that question to the Army and the Navy.

Mr. WHEELER. First of all, the Senator is in error in his statement of facts, and he is in error as to what I said. I believe that the doctors of Montana know me at least as well as does the Senator from Kentucky, or perhaps better.

Mr. BARKLEY. Let me say that if they know the Senator as well as I do, they know him pretty well.

Mr. WHEELER. They do. I have lived there a long time.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have known the Senator for a long time, and I have enjoyed that privilege. I hope the Senator and I can disagree honestly and sincerely, without in any way reflecting upon each other's good faith in the matter. I certainly have no such intention.

Mr. WHEELER. What I said was that many men were being rejected for military service because of the high standards adopted by the Army. That is the only excuse. I assume that the doctors were doing their duty. I believe they were; but I am saying that a great many men in this country, who should be in the Army, are being rejected for military service. I repeat that statement, notwithstanding the fact that some Army officer may say to the contrary. I do not believe that because a man puts on a uniform we must take his word for everything he says. If that situation should arise in the United States, our Government would be gone. The Senator is setting up a straw man, and saying that because someone wears a uniform he is perfect, and that we must not question anything he says or does.

I have called attention to what the Russian Army does. It takes men up to 50 years of age. Russia has the best fighting force in the world. I have called attention to what the British Navy does. It takes men from all classes. What I am saying is that, in my judgment, before the Army takes fathers and destroys the homes of the United States, it ought to take some of the IV-F men. I say further that we ought to drive the slackers out of the Government departments and out of jobs in industry, where they are hiding from the draft.

[Manifestations of applause in the galleries.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUCAS in the chair). Under the rules of the

Senate, occupants of the galleries are not permitted to indulge in manifestations of approval or disapproval. The Chair respectfully requests that the occupants of the galleries respect those rules.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. During the course of his remarks the Senator from Montana referred to slackers in the Government service. He also did so during the examination of the witnesses who appeared before the Military Affairs Committee. I am just as anxious as the Senator from Montana could possibly be to weed out of the Government departments any so-called slackers who are hiding behind desks in order to escape military service. However, it seems to me unfair, without designating who the slackers are, to hurl a general charge against everyone in the Government service because there may be some. I wonder if the Senator from Montana, on his responsibility as a United States Senator, is willing or able to give the name of a single man in the Government service who ought to be in the Army instead of where he is.

Mr. WHEELER. Of course, I cannot particularize.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does the Senator think it is fair to say that there are hundreds of thousands of such men in Washington? I should like to have the Civil Service Commission, the War Manpower Commission, or some other agency, conduct a census in Washington in all the departments to find out how many men there are of military age who could pass a physical examination and go into the Army. There may be some, and if there are any they ought to be weeded out; but I do not think it is fair to condemn all the departments in Washington as being honeycombed with men of that type, unless the Senator can give their names and tell what jobs they hold.

Mr. WHEELER. Let me give certain figures from the Costello committee report with respect to the selective-service status of Federal employees between the ages of 18 and 37. There are 197,656 single men without children.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does the Senator know how many of those 197,656 single men without children have been examined for military service, how many have been accepted, and how many have been rejected?

Mr. WHEELER. No; but I do know that many of them have been deferred by the departments, because of the fact that it is said that they are considered necessary in the Government.

Mr. BARKLEY. That may be. Some of them have been deferred.

Mr. WHEELER. I know that some of them who have been deferred have wives working in the departments.

Mr. BARKLEY. That may be; but some one ought to get the exact information and give it to the Senate.

Mr. WHEELER. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. It ought not to be said that there are hundreds of thousands of them, without identifying a single one of them.

Mr. WHEELER. I agree that some one ought to get the facts; but it is not my duty. It is not my duty to weed them out of the Government service, or out of industry. That is the duty of the Government, and the Government bureaus.

Mr. BARKLEY. General Hershey testified before the committee that such men are being weeded out every day. They are being reexamined every day. I think that any Senator who makes the blanket charge that there are hundreds of thousands of men in the departments who ought to be in the Army, owes some responsibility to the Senate.

Mr. WHEELER. I say that there are hundreds of thousands of men in the Government service, both married and single, who should be in the Army. Many of them have been deferred. The departments have no right to ask for their deferment, because they are not essential to carrying on the services of the Government. The Senator asked me to point out a single individual. I am not going around as a snooper to find out such things. That is not my duty. That is the duty of the heads of the departments.

The Senator and I know of one man who was deferred because of the fact he was in one department drawing down \$10,000 a year, while his wife was working in another department.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator may know about it, but I do not know it. I do not know who the man was.

Mr. WHEELER. The facts have not been made public. I do not care to give his name.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator says he does not care to give his name.

Mr. WHEELER. I do not care to give names on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. BARKLEY. I know how easy it is for Senators—we are all guilty of it now and then—to make blanket charges against groups of persons, but sometimes when we do that we create the impression throughout the United States that here in Washington the heads of various bureaus and departments deliberately hoard men because they want to protect them from being called into military service. However, I submit that when we refer to them we owe it to the country to name them. If I should make a charge of some kind against individuals or a group of individuals I should feel that I should name at least one of them.

Mr. WHEELER. If I should name one of them it would be said it was unfair for me to name him.

Mr. BARKLEY. Instead of naming one, the Senator blankets all of them in his statement.

Mr. WHEELER. What the Senator is seeking to do is to have called married men who are fathers of children and to cause children to be put into the street without first requiring an investigation to be made in various departments, and calling those who are not fathers, and then drafting into the military service the slackers in industry.

If the Senator wants names and statements, I will say to him that I have been

reading for the past 2 hours statements and communications from professors, and representatives of labor organizations, and I have given names. I read communications from the C. I. O. in an aluminum factory, when the Senator was not present in the Chamber. I read a statement received from workers engaged in the automobile industry at Flint. I read statements from representatives of the C. I. O., and certainly the C. I. O. is not antiadministration. I read a statement from the C. I. O. at Rockford, Ill.

Mr. BARKLEY. We all receive letters.

Mr. WHEELER. But these letters give facts.

Mr. BARKLEY. I should like to say—

Mr. WHEELER. Just a moment; I will yield in a moment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Montana refuse to yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. WHEELER. No; I do not refuse to yield. I will yield in a moment. I never refuse to yield to the Senator from Kentucky, but I should like to finish my statement.

All I am asking in the pending bill is that fathers be deferred for 3 months so that we may investigate the charges which have been made by representatives of organized labor, representative businessmen, representative lawyers, and representative doctors from one end of the country to the other. Many complaints have come from them, as well as from leaders of the Catholic Church, the Methodist Church, the Lutheran Church, and every other denomination in the country.

Why the haste? What is the emergency which warrants the Government starting Friday to draft fathers?

I invite attention to the fact that the pending bill was introduced in February of this year, and not a thing was done about it for some time.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Montana did not come before the Military Affairs Committee until the 5th of May.

Mr. WHEELER. Oh, yes; I went before the Military Affairs Committee, but the Senator asked that the bill be sent back to the Military Affairs Committee.

Mr. BARKLEY. What Senator made the request?

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. It was not reported out of the Military Affairs Committee until July 2, 1943.

Mr. WHEELER. I was about to offer the bill on the floor of the Senate as an amendment to a bill then pending, and it was referred to the Military Affairs Committee and I consented to it being sent there. After it was referred to the committee the committee requested reports from the War Department and the Navy Department, both of which sent letters to the committee. I went before the committee in May and was heard with reference to the bill. That was the first time I appeared before the committee. I appeared before

the committee again, because nothing was done about the bill after the first hearing. I went before the committee in July, and in July the committee reported the bill by a vote of 11 to 3. During all that period of time the administration and the various departments to which reference has been made had the matter before them. They knew it was scheduled to come up for consideration, and they could have appeared before the Military Affairs Committee with their generals, their admirals, and everybody else, but they did nothing.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I will yield in a moment. After the bill was reported nothing was done about it until the reconvening of Congress following the summer recess. A few days before Congress reconvened I telegraphed the Senator from Kentucky and asked him to reconvene the Senate in order to take up the bill, because I foresaw exactly the condition which would confront us.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Since the Senator has referred to the history of the bill, allow me to say that the Senator introduced his bill in February.

Mr. WHEELER. That is correct; in February.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator went before the Military Affairs Committee on the 5th of May. The committee heard him, and subsequently submitted a report to the Senate.

Mr. WHEELER. They heard Colonel Keessling.

Mr. BARKLEY. They received letters from the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of War, both of whom opposed the bill.

Mr. WHEELER. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator again went before the Military Affairs Committee, not in a hearing, but to ask them to report the bill, and he stated that if they would do so he would not ask to have the bill taken up on the floor of the Senate until after the summer recess.

Mr. WHEELER. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. It was understood on the part of the Senator from Montana that the bill would not be taken up until after the summer recess. The Senator telegraphed me and asked that under the terms of the joint resolution authorizing the summer recess I take steps to reconvene the Senate in order to take up his bill. I declined to do so, for reasons which I set out in a telegram to him. We then returned after the recess. Practically every Member of the Senate had felt there had been no hearings held upon the bill commensurate with the importance of the subject. Consideration of the bill was delayed so the Military Affairs Committee could hear testimony. Hearings have been held during the past 10 days or 2 weeks.

So if there has been any delay in consideration of the bill, the Army officers and the Navy officers are not responsible. It was not their duty to rush to the Cap-

itol unless they were invited by the committee to come. The committee asked for a report from two Departments—namely, the Navy Department and the War Department—as it always does when considering legislative proposals of this character. The committee made its report, and when the bill was reported the report consisted only of the letter of the Secretary of the Navy and the letter of the Secretary of War. They did not give any facts whatever on which the committee reported the bill. I do not say that in criticism of anyone, but the report contained only the letters from the Secretary of War and from the Secretary of the Navy.

Allow me to return now to the Senator's statement that letters and protests have come from different persons. We all receive letters in protest of something nearly every day. We give them consideration, and, so far as I am concerned, I always answer them in my office. Have the persons who have written to the Senator about individuals who they believe should have been inducted into the Army instead of being rejected gone to the local boards and made their protests there?

Mr. WHEELER. Some of them have.

Mr. BARKLEY. Have any of them gone before the State boards and lodged their protests with those bodies? They have a right to do so. Have they been to their State board and called attention to the fact that, for example, some man who had been examined and rejected appeared to be sufficiently strong and robust to be in the Army? Have the persons who have objected to various things which have taken place gone before the authorities in their local communities and lodged their protests with them. Or have they merely contented themselves with protesting to the members of the Senate, who have no authority to act locally, who do not know anything about the men involved, and cannot have the facts regarding their physical qualifications, so as to enable them to say whether they should be in or out of the Army? It seems to me that any protest about someone in a particular neighborhood being rejected should be taken before the board which has the responsibility of acting.

Mr. WHEELER. If the Senator from Kentucky had been in the Chamber and had listened to me he would have heard me call attention to a number of letters which bear upon that subject. I will read from one of them again.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not care to hear the Senator's speech again.

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator asked for it, and I want to give him the information. Here is the letter from the—

Mr. BARKLEY. Is the letter to which the Senator is about to call attention a part of the printed hearings?

Mr. WHEELER. It is. I will give the name of the organization writing the letter. It is from Local No. 24, Aluminum Workers of America, Fairfield, Conn.

Mr. BARKLEY. On what page of the hearings does the letter appear?

Mr. WHEELER. On page 386. I read:

DEAR SIR: We, the undersigned committee—

This is the Aluminum Workers of America. It is not an antilabor group, or an antiadministration group. This is a group from whom the administration receives some of its chief labor support.

We, the undersigned committee, duly appointed by Local Union No. 24, Aluminum Workers of America, to investigate discrimination in deferments, hereby request that you present the following evidence before the Military Affairs Committee.

We have been investigating deferments for several months, and we find that many single men, working in the United States Aluminum Co. plants in Bridgeport and Fairfield, including the magnesium plant, are given deferments, and married men were drafted. We have also found that men working here came from other States, and were given indefinite deferments by their local boards.

The information we received was to the effect that some States compel their citizens to repay the State, county, or municipality for any relief received during depressions, etc. These men came to work in various defense plants in Connecticut, with indefinite deferments, and each pay day money was sent home to repay the debt. Our local boards, having no jurisdiction over these out-of-State men, could not call them into service. This information was given me by a member of local board 22 B. Our local men were called into service, and although they were experienced men, were replaced by these men with indefinite deferments, who had little or no experience.

We also found that officials of the Aluminum Co. have sons or relations who have been sent to the Fairfield and Bridgeport plants and placed in positions that could be classified as essential to the war efforts. However, we find these men walking around with pads and pencils in their hands or sitting at a typewriter. These men are single and should be drafted.

We have complained to the State selective-service board and given them many names. However, nothing is being done about it.

The Senator asked if complaints had been made. Here is one, and it is stated that nothing has been done about it.

We therefore condemn the practice of selective service in calling married men when single men and men who married since Pearl Harbor were deferred.

We would also recommend that Congress make it compulsory that a committee be appointed in each plant to work in conjunction with management relative to requests for deferments, and making up of replacement schedules.

We would also request that all records of draft boards be open to the public for inspection. This will stop discrimination.

We also find that many men who are single have had five or six deferments and many married men are refused deferments.

We believe that 200 to 275 single men could be taken from these plants. This does not include marriages before Pearl Harbor. Hardship cases are rarely given consideration by local boards. We have a case of James Lewis Martino, order No. 1633, local board 8 B, New Haven, Conn. He is a core maker; married November 27, 1941. He was told by his local board that he could not appeal as he was going in October. We are contacting State selective service headquarters for a deferment. The U. S. Aluminum Co. has applied for a deferment and it was denied. Refusing the man the right to appeal is a violation of the Selective Service Act.

We have complained to General Hershey about the discrimination in deferments, and were referred to the State selective service board at West Hartford, Conn. We contacted

this board and they promised to investigate, but nothing has been done.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator if that is not a letter written to the Senator from Montana by Mr. Clifford S. Unger?

Mr. WHEELER. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. The State selective service boards deal with cases that have come up from the local boards on appeal. Either the man who is inducted can appeal to the State selective service board or the Government itself can do so. The question I ask the Senator is whether, according to this letter, this committee had gone to the local board and pointed out the individuals they thought ought to be drafted and not rejected, because to go first to the State selective service board is to go over the head of the local draft board in each county. Therefore, it seems to me that before resort to the State selective service board, either on appeal or otherwise, there ought to be some effort made to bring these particular cases to the attention of the local draft boards, who are on the ground and who have a right to investigate every one of them if it is brought to their attention.

Mr. WHEELER. I will venture the assertion, without knowing it to be true, that the committee went to a local board first, but I do not know.

Mr. BARKLEY. It does not say that.

Mr. WHEELER. It does not say that, but they went to the State selective service board and then they took it up with General Hershey. What more could they do?

Mr. BARKLEY. In that particular case if they did not go to the local board they ought to have done so. The State selective service board passes upon the questions that come up to them. Either side then can appeal to General Hershey under the law Congress enacted. If they have gone over the head of the local board in regard to individuals who live in the county and concerning whom the local board could have ascertained information, probably they may not have known all the details and minutiae of bringing such matters to the attention of the proper board, but it seems to me that any committee or any individual is acting inadvisedly in overlooking the local board and taking individual cases to the State board without bringing them to the attention of the local board who can investigate the facts.

Mr. WHEELER. Then what the Senator says is if some of the single men were deferred, and they did not go to a local board but only went to the State board, and then went to General Hershey, we ought immediately to hasten to take fathers and break up homes before we have a general investigation and check upon whether other men can be taken. That is the effect of the position the Senator is taking at this time.

Mr. BARKLEY. It is not the effect of the position I am taking.

Mr. WHEELER. I will let the facts speak for themselves.

Mr. BARKLEY. I will say that if we do not raise an army in the United States until all complaints have been investigated the war will be over before we ever get

down to the point where we find out what the facts are.

Mr. WHEELER. Oh, no, that is not any excuse. We have an army at the present time of 7,300,000 men and we can possibly send overseas, according to the Army itself, more than 5,000,000 men at the end of 1944.

Mr. BARKLEY. Let me correct the Senator there. Army officers, including General Marshall and all the others, testified that they propose, according to their plans which have been worked out over a period of months, a net of 5,000,000 men in the Army overseas at the end of 1944. That means, according to their testimony, that they must take over 5,750,000 men in order to have a net 5,000,000 at the time, because the replacements amount to about 75,000 men a month even now, and that number will increase as we become more active on the battle fronts and as casualties increase. So, in order to get a 5,000,000-man army at the end of next year it will be necessary to transport five-and-three-quarters million men.

Mr. WHEELER. That is not what General Marshall said.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the Senator will read the hearings he will find that that was the testimony.

Mr. WHEELER. I have read the testimony. What General Marshall said, at any rate, was that we had an army of 7,300,000. I read from the statement of General McNarney:

Senator WHEELER. Now, I did not quite understand one figure you gave. I may have misunderstood you. My understanding is that you said that you expected to send overseas 5,000,000 by the end of 1944.

General McNARNEY. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the Senator will follow on further in the hearings—

Mr. WHEELER. Wait a moment. I am reading from the testimony of General McNarney:

Senator WHEELER. And by the end of 1943 you expect to have in the Army 7,700,000 men.

General McNARNEY. Correct.

Senator WHEELER. That would leave something like 2,700,000 men in the United States, if you didn't take anyone else in the Army, by the end of 1944?

General McNARNEY. By the end of 1944; yes.

Senator WHEELER. You have 2,700,000 men in the United States.

General McNARNEY. That is correct.

I do not know what could be plainer.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the Senator will read further from the testimony—whether it is on that page or not I do not know—not only General McNarney, but General Marshall himself—

Mr. WHEELER. I read General McNarney's statement, and that is what he said.

Mr. BARKLEY. In my own time I shall read his answer to my question if the Senator does not want to do it.

Mr. WHEELER. I am willing to read it, but I am reading now from the statement made by General McNarney.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. WHEELER. Before yielding I desire to call attention to another statement, because it has been suggested that no one called the facts I have mentioned to the attention of anybody. Here is another complaint from the United Automobile, Aircraft and Agriculture Implement Workers of America, dated September 17, 1943:

United States Senator BURTON K. WHEELER, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We, the undersigned, a committee elected by the membership of Chevrolet Local No. 659, United Automobile Workers—Congress of Industrial Organizations, to investigate the rumors prevalent in the Flint Chevrolet plants that management has appointed mere boys—who are the sons of Chevrolet superintendents and other high officials—foremen, for the sole purpose of enabling them to evade being inducted into the armed services.

The committee was appointed for this purpose.

After investigation we find that unquestionably this has been done and that circumstances make it appear that there may have been collusion between certain corporations and the W. M. C. in this matter.

Some time ago Major General Hershey stated publicly that the only thing that would drive the draft dodgers out of the plant was public indignation.

Who said "draft dodgers"? General Hershey said it.

A short time ago, State Director of Selective Service Pearson stated that corporations who had requested temporary deferment for certain employees had been given sufficient time to replace them and must do so at once.

A few days later management appointed these 22-year-old employees to foremanships, and almost immediately thereafter the War Manpower Commission issued a list of deferable occupations, which included foremen in industry converted to war production. This is what makes it appear as if there may have been collusion.

We would like to point out that it is only necessary for a corporation to request a deferment on Form 42a without explanation, and draft boards have no alternative, but must grant deferment without question as to whether or not the man in whose behalf the request is made is entitled to deferment.

We are confident that these conditions also exist at Buick, A. C. Fisher, and other Flint General Motors plants.

We have also turned over to the local officials of the Federal Bureau of Investigation evidence of gross irregularities in the use of manpower at a time when admittedly a serious manpower shortage exists, but no action has been taken as yet.

Hundreds of women have been hired at Chevrolet to replace men in recent months, yet management of Chevrolet is in the habit of drafting war workers from the shops to work on their private estates and conveying them back and forth to the plant, where they punch in and out, in company cars.

Equipment has also been removed from the plant and transported to the homes of officials of Chevrolet for their private use.

We would respectfully call your attention to the fact that, because of these conditions, the membership of Local No. 659, United Automobile Workers—Congress of Industrial Organizations—Flint, Mich., by secret ballot, voted more than 2 to 1 to repeal the no-strike pledge, and proceeded to set up a strike committee and a committee to investigate draft evasion in the plant.

A virtual state of fascism exists at Chevrolet, and collective bargaining has broken down almost completely.

Most of the men on this committee are veterans of World War No. 1, and we have the word of several hundred veterans that they will not work longer with these draft dodgers, and the sentiment of the rank and file of our local is reflected in the vote to repeal the no-strike pledge.

We request that the Government investigate conditions here without delay for the purpose of keeping Chevrolet-Flint in operation.

Many of our members are being prepared for induction, some of whom have as many as seven children. We ask that the necessary steps be taken to insure that the induction of fathers be halted until these draft dodgers are inducted.

**Mr. BARKLEY.** Will the Senator yield in order that I may call attention to General Marshall's testimony upon the question of the 5,000,000 men, on page 284 of the hearings?

**Mr. WHEELER.** Yes, but I was reading General McNarney's testimony.

**Mr. BARKLEY.** General McNarney answered at another place the same question which I propounded to General Marshall, but if the Senator will permit, I should like to read what General Marshall said, as it is found on page 284 of the record, about the middle of the page:

Senator BARKLEY. Would you be able to estimate the number above 5,000,000 that you will have to send over, in order to have a net army of 5,000,000?

General MARSHALL. Seven hundred and fifty-thousand.

Senator BARKLEY. So that you would really have to send over a total number of 5,750,000 men, in order to have an army, a net army, of 5,000,000 at the end of next year?

General MARSHALL. Yes, sir.

Senator BARKLEY. And those 750,000 would have to be drawn into the Army from those not now in, except as it would involve men already in the Army who had been sent back?

General MARSHALL. That is correct.

Senator BARKLEY. And you think that the shipping, the increase in our shipping facilities, as we understand them to be, will be sufficient to create the momentum from day to day or month to month that will enable you to send that many men overseas?

General MARSHALL. That is according to our calculations.

**Mr. WHEELER.** That is, according to his calculation that he wants to have 5,000,000 men overseas, but according to his own figures, he is still going to have about 2,700,000 men in the United States at the end of 1944.

**Mr. BARKLEY.** A large number of them will still be in training, because they will be taken in at the end of this year.

**Mr. WHEELER.** If they are still to be in training, then there is no excuse whatever for taking 446,000 fathers before 1946, because we would still have over a year to train them.

**Mr. BARKLEY.** We undertook, when we passed the draft law, to provide that men should not be sent overseas until they had had a year's training, and that is what the Army has attempted to do when they have trained them in units. They have made exceptions to that rule where they have to put men in existing units as replacements, because they can train a man who goes into an old unit more rapidly than they can train a whole new unit, on the same theory that we

who were raised in the country understand that if we train a young horse we can train him faster if we put him in a team with an older horse than if we put two young horses together.

**Mr. WHEELER.** It does not make any difference; if we take 446,000 fathers and put them into the Army tomorrow, and ship them overseas at the end of 1944, we will still have 2,700,000 men left in the United States. I do not think for a moment that the Army is going to take these 446,000 men and ship them overseas and put them into the various units, when they will have available men who have been trained for 2 or 3 years, and who are still in the United States doing guard duty around bridges, and performing other work of that kind. When someone who happened to put on the uniform a year or so ago now comes forward and says, "We have to have these men, and we cannot have anyone but first-class combat soldiers to do guard work," it just does not make common, ordinary sense, and I refuse to follow some statements which have been made merely because they are made by some Army officer, if they do not make sense.

**Mr. BARKLEY.** Does the Senator know how many bridges are being guarded in the United States?

**Mr. WHEELER.** No; but I know the testimony was that about one-third of the Army is needed for noncombat service.

**Mr. BARKLEY.** The Senator is mistaken in that. The testimony was that about one-third of the Army is required for what they call housekeeping. I do not like that word, because it creates a misinterpretation of what the men are doing.

**Mr. WHEELER.** That is what the Army used to call it.

**Mr. BARKLEY.** That includes truck drivers who take ammunition up to the front; it includes engineers who prepare roads and bridges; it includes everyone who is not actually carrying a gun or operating a tank or an airplane. So when we say that it takes a third of the Army to perform these other duties in order to keep the Army moving, and we call that housekeeping, it creates the impression that all they are doing is sweeping and cooking.

**Mr. WHEELER.** I have not called it housekeeping; that is what the Army calls it. But the British are taking and have been taking men who, while perhaps unfit for combat duty, can drive trucks, and the British have been putting them into the Army. If the British Army can do it, then there is no reason why the Army of the United States should not do it before we break up American homes. That is the very thing for which I am contending. In order to be a truck driver a man does not have to be physically fit enough to be a combat soldier, and when the Army discharges 275,000 men between the ages of 38 and 45, 275,000 in one crack, will anyone tell me they could not be used as truck drivers? Will anyone tell me that when such men pass the highest physical examination of the Army before they are taken in they cannot drive trucks and do housekeeping duty, but

should be discharged from the Army, while the father is to be taken from his children and his wife compelled to go to work in a factory, as the wives are doing in many instances, in order to support themselves and the children, thus destroying the American home?

There used to be a Federal judge in Montana, one of the very best judges we ever had, who used to say, "Ordinarily you know by the weight of the evidence what the facts are, but if a man comes in and tells you he saw an elephant climbing a telephone pole, you do not have to believe it." When some one says that men between the ages of 38 and 45, who have passed a physical examination, could not drive trucks and do some of the "housekeeping" work, it does not make good sense, particularly in view of the fact that the Russian Army, the greatest fighting force in the world today, takes such men up to 50 years, and in view of the fact, as I stated a moment ago, that the British Army and Navy both take such men, and the English boast that they have the greatest navy in the world.

**Mr. HILL.** Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

**Mr. WHEELER.** I yield.

**Mr. HILL.** In reference to truck drivers, some truck drivers in the Army have to have just as much, if not more, stamina as the men in the front line, in combat duty. Truck drivers in theaters of operations oftentimes have to drive hours on end, 36 hours, 40 hours, without rest, without sleep, perhaps without food, and with but little water, over all kinds of roads, under all kinds of shelling and other fire, and under all kinds of conditions.

I did not rise to ask the Senator from Montana particularly with respect to truck drivers. I did have this thought in mind, and I wanted to ask the Senator about it. To hear the Senator's remarks one might draw the conclusion that the Federal Government was a refuge for draft dodgers, or an asylum for slackers. Can the Senator from Montana tell us how many men now employed in the Federal Government are deferred because of their employment in the Government?

**Mr. WHEELER.** I have already stated that I cannot give the figures. I have seen the figures but I do not know what they are. There are committees of Congress, however, the Costello and other committees, who are investigating the matter.

**Mr. HILL.** Will the Senator bear with me a moment?

**Mr. WHEELER.** I should like to continue my speech.

**Mr. HILL.** I think this is important.

**Mr. WHEELER.** Very well, I yield.

**Mr. HILL.** The Senator made a statement to the effect that there were hundreds of thousands of men between 18 and 38 in the Government service. That may be true. I do not know. But, Mr. President, it should be remembered that there are some 3,000,000 men who have been deferred because of physical disability because they have not met the physical standards of the Army and the Navy. Naturally, of that number of

3,000,000 there are some who are in the Government service. But they are not deferred because they are in the Government service. They are deferred because they do not meet the physical requirements.

Mr. WHEELER. That is correct.

Mr. HILL. Today more than five and a half million men are deferred because they are fathers. Naturally some of those five and a half million fathers are in the Government service, but they are not deferred because they are in the Government service. They are deferred because they are fathers.

The Selective Service advises us that there are 112,399 men deferred because of their employment in the Government service. Because they occupy positions in the Government service on this occupational basis, boards have deferred them. Of those 112,399, 96,658 are either with the Civil Aeronautics Authority, with the Navy Department, with the War Department, the Panama Canal, the War Shipping Administration, or the United States Maritime Commission. The 96,000 men who are employed by the Navy Department, the War Department, the Shipping Administration, and so forth, include men who are in Government arsenals, who are today making guns of all kinds. They include men who are in the shipbuilding plants.

Not long ago I went to the navy yard at Norfolk to witness the launching of the battleship *Alabama*, one of our greatest and finest battleships. That ship had been built by Government employees; it was not built under contract. A number of the men in that plant today are deferred just as men would be deferred in a private shipbuilding plant on the west coast.

Outside the Army and Navy and shipbuilding plants, how many are deferred? In the many other governmental agencies, 15,741 men are deferred, and of the 15,741 who are deferred in all the other agencies of the Government, according to the estimates of the Selective Service, only about 7,500 could qualify and meet the physical requirements.

So, Mr. President, the statement that the Government is a haven for draft dodgers and an asylum for slackers simply is not true.

I could give the Senator a break-down now, but I shall do so later in my own time, of how many men are deferred in every agency in all the departments of Government; all of them, including the shipyard workers and ordnance men, and workers for the Civil Aeronautics Authority as aeronautical engineers, some of whom were with General Clark at Salerno. The whole number is 15,741.

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator says that of the 15,000 only 7,500 could qualify.

Mr. HILL. According to the Selective Service; yes.

Mr. WHEELER. How can the Selective Service know that?

Mr. HILL. By knowing the percentage who have qualified in the past. They know that so many men have been examined, and 3,000,000 have already been disqualified for physical reasons.

Mr. WHEELER. That is simply a guess upon their part.

Mr. HILL. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. WHEELER. No, Mr. President.

Mr. HILL. The Senator ought to have this information; I know he wants it.

Mr. WHEELER. Very well; I yield.

Mr. HILL. Let me advise the Senator and the Senate of the United States, that under the provisions of the act of June 8, 1943, introduced by the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] and the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Selective Service has filed each month with the Vice President, the presiding officer of the Senate, and with the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the name of each person in the Government service deferred under the Selective Service Act, the position he holds, his age, and the draft board which deferred him. When the first list was filed, June 8, 1943, it included every man who had been deferred under the Selective Service Act because of his being employed in the Government. Since then each month every other deferment has been listed. Here is one of the most recent reports, if Senators would like to look at it, containing the names and the positions of the men deferred. So there is no secret about who has been deferred. Anyone who has any question as to whether a person ought to have been deferred, what work he is doing and how important his job is, the list is here, filed with the Senate of the United States, for anyone to search and see.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for an observation?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield for a question; not for a speech.

Mr. MAYBANK. I simply wish to make the suggestion, which I have made before, and I hope will be followed, that the names be listed as soon as possible in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I am glad to see that only 134 persons from South Carolina are listed as being deferred. I think the people of South Carolina are entitled to know that only 134 persons from my State are deferred by reason of being in Government service.

Mr. HILL. The Senator speaks of 134 persons from his State being deferred.

Mr. MAYBANK. Excluding those employed in the navy yard.

Mr. HILL. Excluding those employed in the navy yard?

Mr. MAYBANK. Yes. Two thousand one hundred and sixteen persons from my State are employed in the navy yard.

Mr. WHEELER. I am glad to have the Senator from South Carolina tell us that so small a number of persons from his State are deferred. But I wish to say that in my judgment one of the greatest hoarders of manpower is the War Department itself. A stenographer from my State, employed in the War Department, came to see me. She said she had been in the War Department for 6 months and had not had to do a day's work while she had been there. Not only that, but she told me other girls were quitting their jobs in the War Department because they were ashamed to take the money; that some of them had

gone to work waiting on tables in the city of Washington. Senators can defend Government bureaus all they want to, but I say that there is more waste, more extravagance of manpower in the various Government bureaus in Washington than any other place I know of.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. WHEELER. No, Mr. President.

Mr. HILL. The Senator has talked about the War Department. I think the Senate is entitled to information with respect to it.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I am trying to make a speech.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Montana has quoted a young lady who is a stenographer in the War Department. Let us see what the picture is in the War Department. Let us see what the facts are.

Mr. WHEELER. I refuse to yield.

Mr. HILL. Will not the Senator yield so I may make a statement with respect to the War Department?

Mr. WHEELER. No.

Mr. HILL. The Senator has talked about the War Department.

Mr. WHEELER. I am not going to be interrupted every minute. I should like to proceed with my speech.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. WHEELER. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Montana does not contend that the girl who spoke to him, or any other girl in the War Department, ought to be taken out of the Department and placed in the Army?

Mr. WHEELER. No.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does the Senator include them when he is talking about persons who are idle in the Government departments?

Mr. WHEELER. No. As a matter of fact I thought much waste would result from taking into the service a great number of WAC's and WAVES. I may be wrong about that. I do not think they are relieving as many men in the armed forces as it was contended they would when it was urged that they be taken into the service. I do not think they have relieved anyone.

Mr. President, I think a number of men in IV-F should be taken into the service to drive trucks, watch bridges, and so on before married men who have children are taken into the service. The Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] does not agree with me. Other Members of the Senate may not agree with me. They may feel that we should proceed to take fathers before we look into and examine all other possibilities. They may feel that before we do that we should take the married men, thus breaking up their homes. I say to the Senate that its Members may not believe that the married men should be deferred until other means have been exhausted, but the American people do believe it.

Now, let me proceed.

So far as my statements are concerned, let me say that what I have said is nothing more than what the junior

Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] said in his speech about the hoarding of manpower in industries, nothing more than what Mr. Baruch himself said, nothing more than what was said in the Costello report, nothing more than what every investigating committee has reported—identically the same thing.

Here is a letter from Hiram H. Owens, attorney and counselor at law at Barbourville, Ky. The letter is dated September 16, 1943:

DEAR SENATOR: You are entirely correct in your position that the greatest waste of manpower is in our Army. Everywhere one sees men in uniform loafing, coming, going—on furlough. It would require 10 years to transport and equip properly at the battle front the men now in service. Ask them; they will tell you how useless their time is spent.

No father should be forced into the Army—too many in now—for efficient service. We need more men on farms, in mines, in war plants.

It will cripple our war effort to put more in, than leave them employed profitably.

Here is a letter from Paducah, Ky. I do not know just where that is, but I have heard of it.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is my home town, and I am very proud of that fair city.

Mr. WHEELER. I understand it is a fine city.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I am almost as proud of Paducah as the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] is of Asheville.

Mr. WHEELER. The letter is from a Dr. Jones, of Paducah:

DEAR SENATOR: We note in the daily press, in questioning General Hershey before your committee, you have been trying to find ways and means of avoiding sending fathers to the Army, which is very commendable. There is a great deal of adverse comment and criticism in this part of the United States about General Hershey's rule of letting many young men escape the draft, around 18 to 20, by allowing them to go to technical schools for special training such as study medicine, dentistry, engineers, etc. In this county alone (which is an average county in population), there have been around 150 to 200 of these stout, healthy, able-bodied single young men who have been sent by the Government to medical schools, engineering training, etc., giving them free tuition, upkeep, and paying them \$50 per month while they are getting this special training, and by so doing they have been exempted from the draft, escaping doing their duty toward their Government. We all know, and General Hershey should realize that by the time they complete this training, the war will likely be over, and they will not only escape doing their duty to their country but get paid by the Government and at the same time get this training free, while their neighbor boy friends are having to render real service by going into the draft.

As an illustration—

Then he states the name of a boy. I shall not repeat his name.

Further on in the letter Dr. Jones states:

You multiply the above 150 by the 120 counties in this State and thousands of counties in the United States, you will readily see the number of boys in these technical schools avoiding the draft, which will probably run around 100,000 or more.

We sincerely trust you will use your influence to have General Hershey abolish this unjust rule, as I feel that I am voting

the sentiment of every patriotic citizen everywhere.

The writer was in World War No. 1, and when a schoolmate entering the draft sees his classmate escaping same, as per above, it naturally makes him sore at the injustice and feels like he is not getting a square deal. This unjust rule should by all means be abolished so that every healthy, single boy should be made to serve his country alike.

We hope General Hershey will see the justice of the above.

Mr. BARKLEY. Is that Dr. F. A. Jones?

Mr. WHEELER. Yes; Dr. F. A. Jones.

Mr. BARKLEY. I know him. Of course, I do not know about the instance of injustice to which he refers, but I do know the members of the local draft board of McCracken County, and I do not think a finer group of men could be found anywhere. They are men who serve their country without pay, as we all know, and as the members of all other draft boards do. I would not say that draft board or any other draft board is perfect, and I would not say that draft boards have not made some mistakes, just as everyone else makes mistakes, but I would say that board and all other draft boards in the country on the whole have done a fine job in the effort to pass upon every individual case which comes before them under the selective-service law.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I said that a moment ago; but I also say that some of them are resigning.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does the Senator know how many draft boards there are in the country?

Mr. WHEELER. No.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think there are 6,500 of them. Does the Senator know how many of them have resigned?

Mr. WHEELER. I cannot tell, but I know I have letters saying that some are resigning.

Mr. BARKLEY. Perhaps two or three have resigned.

Mr. WHEELER. Two or three? Mr. President, I have in my files letters saying that draft boards have resigned, and stating the reasons why they have resigned.

Now I want to read a letter from a soldier:

SEPTEMBER 15, 1943.

DEAR SENATOR WHEELER: I thought you might be interested to know that us boys in the Army feel that the drafting of fathers is one of the most stupid things that has ever been forced upon the American people. Every single day we see manpower being squandered and wasted and when the scandals of this war are uncovered, one of the biggest will be the way the Army has thrown away manpower at the expense of the war effort.

Facts are wanted. There are some. I continue to read:

We don't need fathers, in fact we don't need any more until the men we now have are efficiently utilized. It is a national crime against our country and against the relatives of dying men for the Army to waste manpower the way it is doing. By having such a huge surplus of men in camps in this country the Army is encouraging loafing because there is not even enough "made work" to keep them busy. I entered the Army from a farm where I worked from 14 to 16 hours a day; now in the Army I'm lucky if I get 2 hours of work a day. And I don't mind saying that I dislike it

very much. A lot of us have a lot of energy and we'd like to work hard to help win this war, but the Army forces us to sit around doing nothing just trying to impress the enemy by quoting a certain-million-man Army. I have bad eyes which keep me out of combat or I might be lucky enough to go overseas where there is action, but just because I am kept in this country I'd like to ask very frankly why the Army is allowed to waste me and hundreds more like me. I actually feel guilty when I get paid each month because I know I haven't earned it; there is no work to do. And yet the Army insists on taking fathers into the Army.

I hope you Members of Congress can figure this thing out because us fellows can't understand why the Army is allowed to misuse and waste its manpower the way it does. We feel that everybody, including the Army, should cooperate in the winning of this war as quickly as possible.

Very sincerely yours for a better country.

Signed by a sergeant at a proving ground in Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I am sure that if the Senator will turn that letter over to the War Department, that young fellow will have plenty of work to do afterward.

Mr. WHEELER. I am sure that if I were to turn the letter in, he would be put in the guardhouse.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Does the sergeant say whether he is married?

Mr. WHEELER. He does not.

Mr. LUCAS. I wondered whether he was one of the 750,000 married men, who have wives and children, who now are in the Army.

Mr. WHEELER. I do not know whether he is or is not one of them; but let me say that a great many of the married men who already are in the Army are young officers.

Mr. LUCAS. Let me ask the Senator how he differentiates between a father who had a child 1 day before Pearl Harbor and a father who had a child 1 day after Pearl Harbor.

Mr. WHEELER. I do not know that such a differentiation should be made. I notice that the President said he did not see any difference between them, and I think possibly he is right. I do not differentiate between them. Possibly no one can make such a differentiation; but I fixed that date because it is the date which was talked about so much and was put in. If the Senator would vote for the bill with such an amendment, I should be glad to amend it, to that extent, in order to meet with his approval.

Mr. LUCAS. The point is not whether the Senator from Illinois votes for the bill or against it. That is not the point.

Mr. WHEELER. The point is that the Senator wants to pick out some little detail in it so that he can have some excuse for voting against it. Is not that the real reason?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Montana is absolutely mistaken. I am not looking for any excuses one way or the other. I will take my chances on whatever I do with respect to the vote on the bill and will vote according to my conscientious conviction, and in line with

what I believe to be the best for my country in the greatest crisis through which we have ever passed.

Mr. WHEELER. I am sure the Senator will.

Mr. LUCAS. I think the Army has been right up to this time and I think the Senator from Montana has been wrong up to this time.

Mr. WHEELER. I know the Senator does, but the Senator's constituents in Illinois may think I am right.

Mr. LUCAS. That may be true. What my constituents in Illinois may think is one thing and what the Senator may think is another thing. Let me say to the Senator and to the Senate that my own political future is of no consequence, if that is what the Senator is referring to. I am attempting honestly as a Member of the United States Senate, looking far into the future, to do what is best for my country. When General Marshall, General McNarney, General Hershey, Mr. Baruch, and others appear before the Military Affairs Committee and testify as they do, I am duty-bound to follow them. They testified that a certain timetable must be met. When they tell me that if they are not able to go through with this program it may mean the prolongation of the war—and the sacrifice of additional lives of fine American boys—what am I to do, follow those men or follow the Senator from Montana?

Mr. WHEELER. I do not ask the Senator to follow me. I do not expect him to do so.

Mr. LUCAS. That is a serious question with me. I ask the question in good faith.

Mr. WHEELER. I know the Senator is asking it in good faith. When Congress returned after its recess, the Senator said that he was not familiar with the facts.

Mr. LUCAS. I was not. Neither was the Senator familiar with the facts. He did not know anything about them at that time.

Mr. WHEELER. In the Senator's view I never know anything about anything.

Mr. LUCAS. I have great respect for the Senator from Montana. I say that in all sincerity. I like the Senator from Montana. He makes a persuasive argument on any question he presents, and I usually listen to him; but because I disagree with him and because I make my argument, I do not want the Senator to try to humiliate me.

Mr. WHEELER. I would not try to humiliate the Senator for anything in the world. I have not the slightest intention of doing so. I have a very deep affection for the Senator.

Mr. LUCAS. I believe the Senator has. I was never more serious in my life than I am now, because, God knows, I do not want to do anything to break up a home and turn children into the streets. That is the emotional plea which the Senator has been making here all afternoon, and he has repeated it a dozen times. If my emotions were to control me, I would not send anybody into the Army; but, as I see it, there is something involved besides emotion.

Mr. WHEELER. That is correct. There is something more involved. I

have said this repeatedly, and if the Senator cannot see it, it is not my fault. We have manpower hoarding in industry, and we will not take for the Army any men classified as IV-F. The British Navy takes great numbers of men who would be classified as IV-F under our system. The British Army also takes many men whom we would classify as IV-F. So does the Russian Army. The Government of the United States released from the Army 275,000 men between the ages of 38 and 45, after they had passed the strictest physical examination. If the Army will take some of the men classified as IV-F, and take single men between the ages of 38 and 45, it will not need to take a single father at this time.

I am not responsible for what has been done. I am not responsible for the delay. Congress is not responsible. The responsibility rests upon the administration, because of the confusion and inefficiency which have been charged to exist by many committees of Congress which have investigated the situation. The charges are made by both Democrats and Republicans. Because of such inefficiency it is said that we must take fathers. I say that we should not do it, and must not do it, because to take fathers would be to break up the homes of America. Let me repeat that I will not consent to sending fathers overseas.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator keeps talking about breaking up homes. Of course, that is one of the most serious things we can contemplate. War is one of the things that breaks up homes. The point that bothers me is what General Marshall and General McNarney testified with respect to the possible prolongation of the war. Those are cold, hard facts. No one knows whether they are right or not, but for the purpose of this vote I must assume they are correct.

Mr. WHEELER. They did not say that they wanted fathers.

Mr. LUCAS. They said that they had to meet a timetable.

Mr. WHEELER. Let me say to the Senator—

Mr. LUCAS. They said that they had to meet a timetable, and they had to have men.

Mr. WHEELER. Yes; they said they had to have men. They can get the men without taking fathers. The opponents of the bill tried to get General Marshall, Admiral King, and General McNarney to say that they wanted to take fathers. When General Marshall was about to testify, and motion pictures were being made, he was asked about turning on the lights. Someone said something to the effect that, "If you say you are going to take fathers, we will not take any more pictures."

Who was doing it? Why was it being done? The effort was being made to get General Marshall to say that he had to have fathers. He refused to say it. Admiral King refused to say it and General McNarney refused to say it.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The only thing I am seriously considering in connection with all this debate, in all of its importance and its many ramifications, is what those witnesses testified with respect to prolonging the war. That stands out pretty clearly in my mind. I sat there and listened to them. They said that if the time table were broken at this hour, and the program were delayed for a period of 3 months, it would probably cost the lives of thousands upon thousands of additional American boys; and not only that, but it would probably mean the drafting of additional fathers after January 1, 1944.

Mr. WHEELER. Does the Senator think for one moment that the 275,000 men between the ages of 38 and 45, who passed every physical test of the Army, and who were trained by the Army, some of them for a year, some for 2 years, and some for a longer period, could not be used to guard bridges, electric light plants, the Senate Office Building, the White House, and other places throughout the country? Does the Senator think that they could not drive trucks, and to that extent be used instead of fathers, when the taking of fathers would mean the breaking up of homes?

Will the Senator answer that question?

Mr. LUCAS. I am frank to admit that I do not know anything about the condition of those men; but I am willing to make a guess, as the Senator has been doing many times this afternoon, as to the possibility of using many of those men. I dare say that many of those men between the ages of 38 and 45 could perform the duties about which the Senator is talking. There is no question about that. But that is water over the dam. We sat by here and permitted those men to be released from the Army.

Mr. WHEELER. What did we have to do with it?

Mr. LUCAS. We could have enacted legislation—

Mr. WHEELER. Oh, no.

Mr. LUCAS. Wait a moment, if the Senator will further yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. We could have enacted legislation providing for what the Senator is now attempting to do, but we did not do it. Neither have we done anything with respect to the drafting of fathers. We have sat by until now, at a time when an attempt is being made to break up the timetable of the American Army, a timetable which has been planned by General Marshall and his subordinates for months.

Mr. WHEELER. I did not sit idly by. I introduced this bill last February.

Mr. LUCAS. This is the first time we have heard anything about it on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. WHEELER. This is not the first time we have heard about it. The Senator probably did not hear about it, but I made two speeches on the floor of the Senate on this very subject, on two different occasions. I appeared before the Military Affairs Committee twice. Now, because of the fact that the Military Affairs Committee did not report the bill earlier, and because of the fact that the

Congress, as the Senator says, sat idly by and permitted men between the ages of 38 and 45 to be released, and because of the fact that there is hoarding of labor in industry, it is said that we must break up American homes. If that be good logic, then I do not know what good logic is.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator can draw any conclusions he desires as to my intentions. Let me repeat what I said previously with respect to this very serious matter. I know that today 750,000 fathers are now in the American Army. Many homes have been broken up. Wives and children have been left behind. I know that some of the fathers have already made the supreme sacrifice in Italy and the southwest Pacific in fighting for this country and the preservation of liberty. I am more concerned about the preservation of the 750,000 family men who now are in the Army facing the foe than I am about the 350,000 men about whom we are talking, who may be subject to the draft. I doubt that 5 percent of this group will ever see any overseas service.

Mr. WHEELER. Allow me to say to the Senator—

Mr. LUCAS. If I may be allowed, I should like to proceed, and then I shall not say any more upon this subject.

I have followed the evidence, and I have attempted conscientiously to reach some kind of an honest conviction upon the troublesome problem now before the United States Senate. Much as I dislike to do so, I am duty bound to follow our high Army and Navy officials who say that at this particular time they must have these men in order that the war effort may not be delayed or impaired.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, let me say that that is not the testimony. Of course, the witnesses did say they had to have the men.

Mr. LUCAS. They said, too, that if they did not get them, the war would be prolonged.

Mr. WHEELER. They said they thought it might prolong the war. However, let me say that, after all, the question is not whether we get the men.

Mr. LUCAS. The question is whether getting them will shorten the war.

Mr. WHEELER. Please allow me to finish. Some have said they would rather take General Marshall's word than my word. The question is not one as between General Marshall's word and my word concerning whether we get the men. The question is whether, because of the inefficiency and stupidity, if we want to call it such, of those who conduct the program, we shall force the draft boards to take married men if men cannot be obtained from some other source, as they could be if the standards were reduced to the level of the English and the Russian standards. If that were done, we could get the men, and that could be done. It could be done tomorrow or the next day and we could get the men if we wanted to do so.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Some question concerning what General Marshall did say seems to have been raised here.

Mr. WHEELER. Yes.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I hope the Senator will not object to my reading from the printed record on that point.

Mr. WHEELER. Very well.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I think that by doing so we may put the question at rest. The following question was asked by me of General Marshall:

Is this conclusion correct, general: That the Army needs a number of men, and it makes no difference to the Army whether they are men with children or without children; is that correct?

General Marshall's answer was as follows:

That is correct. Our interest is that we get men of a certain physical state and a certain mental ability; and we are concerned at the same time that it does not cut production.

Then the following question was asked:

The order in which men shall be taken from civil life into the armed forces through the selective service is a matter for determination by the War Manpower Commission?

General Marshall's answer was:

That is correct, sir.

Then the following question was asked by me:

Then, in the final analysis, on the bill that is before the Congress today, it is a matter as to whether or not the Congress is going to approve the plan that has been brought forth by the War Manpower Commission? That is correct, is it not?

General Marshall replied:

I think that is correct.

I then asked:

It is not a question of a quarrel with the Army or a difference with the Army on its requisitions for men; it is more or less a question of whether the Congress will approve the order in which men are to be taken from civil life as laid down by the War Manpower Commission?

General Marshall's answer to the question was:

Yes, sir; so long as we get the men, and the production of military material is not affected.

In other words, General Marshall said directly in answer to those questions that it made no difference to the Army whether the men who were taken had children or did not have children, that the question, and the sole question, arising on this bill is whether Congress shall approve what has been taking place under the rules of the War Manpower Commission.

Mr. WHEELER. That is correct. Allow me to quote further from the printed hearings. In regard to the drafting of fathers, General Marshall said:

As to the drafting of fathers, that is a moot question. It seems to me that you start off with very young men as a natural component of our Army, but as to what point men may actually be relieved from their responsibility of defense of their country—I do not know what the answer is—that is a matter more for you gentlemen to determine than it is for me.

The junior Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] asked this question:

Well, General Marshall, let me put it to you this way: Do you believe, other things being equal, that a man who leaves behind a wife and one, two, or three children, who must perhaps live on \$50 or \$75 a month, and perhaps go hungry doing it, and break down their former standard of living—do you believe that that man with that worry and burden constantly in mind about his wife and children will make a good soldier?

What was the answer, Mr. President? It was as follows:

No; I do not believe, if that is the condition that is to be imposed, that you would have. You would have a very unhappy soldier with a very low state of morale, and he would not be a very effective soldier for us.

I have read from General Marshall's testimony.

As I have said, at no time did General Marshall, or any other general, or anyone else in the Army or in the Navy say they wanted married men, but their whole trend was that they preferred young single men to married men. Of course, the whole burden of the administration and the whole burden of certain newspapers has been to the effect that I am disagreeing with General Marshall. I submit there is not one scintilla of evidence anywhere in the record that I have had any disagreement with General Marshall upon any of his statements. There have been prominent men who have stated that the Army is too large and that manpower is being wasted.

As a matter of fact, the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], chairman of the Senate Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program, has said, as I recall his statement, that he felt that the Army was too large, or that they were wasting manpower. Other Senators have said so. I have never at any time stated that I thought the Army was too large, because I did not know what the facts were. However, I do say that it is little less than criminal, in my judgment, to break up homes and drive the children into the streets, when delinquency is on the increase. Mr. Hoover, of the F. B. I., has said that in the United States it has increased 64 percent in the last 6 months, among boys and girls under 18 years of age. Clergymen of every denomination in the country have said they are shocked at the increased delinquency which is occurring among the girls and boys of the country, and particularly among the girls. Delinquency among the young girls has increased to a greater extent than it has among the boys. Yet, Mr. President, Senators seemingly disregard that development, and say that because some Army officer has said, "We cannot use men with minor defects to drive trucks," and perform noncombatant duties, such men must not be used. It is said that we must not question the judgment of any general or, if you please, of any corporal, sergeant, or anyone else. How ridiculous.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield there?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McCLELLAN in the chair). Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator has stated in his remarks that "they" have tried to get General Marshall and other persons to say certain things. I do not know to whom the Senator referred when he said "they" tried to get General Marshall to say that they had to have the married men.

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator may draw his own conclusion as to whom I was referring.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator has said "they" tried to get General Marshall to say that they had to have these married men, and that "they" tried to get General McNarney to say this, and that "they" tried to get other persons to say that. I do not know to whom the Senator referred when he said "they."

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator may draw his own conclusions.

Mr. BARKLEY. I suppose the Senator means the members of the committee, or all the Senators who were at the committee meeting and asked questions.

Mr. WHEELER. I said the Senator may draw his own conclusions.

Mr. BARKLEY. Very well; I will draw my own conclusions. However, I should like to point out General Marshall's conclusion, as he stated it in his testimony.

Mr. WHEELER. Very well. I have read it.

Mr. BARKLEY. No; the Senator read a part of it, but not all of it.

I asked General Marshall some questions, as I was permitted to do by the committee, and as I did of other witnesses.

Mr. WHEELER. That is true.

Mr. BARKLEY. I said this to General Marshall:

You, of course, hesitate to get into the manpower question and into the function of the Selective Service.

General Marshall all through his testimony emphasized the fact that he would have to have this number of men, but that if he did not obtain that number of men, it would be necessary to reduce not only the timetable of the war, but reduce the plans for the war overseas, and that to do so would slow up the operations, and might result in prolongation of the war and, ultimately, the loss of more lives.

That was his attitude but he insisted, all the way through, that it was not his function to run the Manpower Commission or to determine where these men should be obtained though he had to have them in the Army. I asked him this question:

You, of course, hesitate to get into the manpower question and into the function of the Selective Service. But what you do, after all of your consultations, day by day, and probably several times a day, as to the size, make-up, and character and standard of the Army, you submit your requests or requisitions, whatever you may call them, to the Selective Service or Manpower Commission.

General MARSHALL. Yes, sir.

Senator BARKLEY. It is their job to furnish these men.

General MARSHALL. Yes, sir.

Senator BARKLEY. It is their job to furnish the type of men, physically and mentally, and I imagine in some cases morally—I don't know to what extent that cuts a figure.

General MARSHALL. That is hard to determine.

Senator BARKLEY. At least the physical and mental standards of the Army, after long deliberations as to what is necessary.

General MARSHALL. Yes, sir.

Senator BARKLEY. In order to make it the most efficient Army possible.

General MARSHALL. Yes, sir.

Senator BARKLEY. Now, if it is true, as the Manpower Commission and the Selective Service have both testified here, if it is true that they cannot obtain the Army that you require—and the Navy too, all of this comes now through the Selective Service, except enlistments under 17 in the Navy, I believe and some over 38, but I suppose they are not large in numbers—if they have testified that it is impossible to obtain these men without the drafting of 446,000 married men, and we should say to the Selective Service, and to the War Department, that you shall not draft that 446,000 men, so that that would be postponed either until January, or they would be exempted or deferred permanently, assuming, however, that the number cannot be obtained, according to the Manpower Commission and Selective Service, without these 446,000, and assuming that we would exempt them or defer them until January 1, your statement is, and your position is, that it would make necessary such a slowing-up of your program, which has been arrived at over a long period of months—it would be a very dangerous enterprise upon which to embark?

General MARSHALL. That is my view of the matter, sir. Not only would it be dangerous but we would immediately have to wreck units in order to meet what we consider the imperative demands of the next 3 months.

Mr. WHEELER. Let me analyze that statement. Assuming that men cannot be obtained from any other place, assuming this and assuming that, of course, General Marshall, with all these assumptions, would say the Army would have to take married men or it could not get the number of men it wanted.

Mr. BARKLEY. In my question I was assuming that the Manpower Commission and the Selective Service were telling the truth.

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator was assuming that they were a hundred percent right, and that some other commission was a hundred percent right. Assuming they could not get men out of industries for the draft, assuming the facts given to me today by the C. I. O. as to conditions in factories were not correct, assuming this and assuming that, assuming there were not any more men to be obtained, and that the Army could not get back the 270,000 men who were let out, assuming not only that, but that it could not use the thousands of men in the IV-F classification, who, according to the information coming from one end of the country to the other, have been let out of the Army after having been taken in—assuming all these things, of course General Marshall could only answer the question as he did.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the Senator continues to talk about 275,000 men. As I understand, in the hearings he referred to 395,000. I wondered if the Senator would not let me make a state-

ment on this question? I think we ought to have the other side of this issue.

Mr. WHEELER. I think so, but the Senator can make the statement in his own time. I have been on my feet 4 hours, and I should like to proceed further and not be interrupted by a reading of figures. I think I have been generous in yielding to questions and also in letting Senators make statements as I have proceeded. I have great respect and love for the Senator from Alabama, but I should like to have him make his statement in his own time.

Mr. HILL. When the Senator says he loves me—and I know the feeling is mutual—I cannot insist on his yielding at this time.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield, but not for a speech.

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator knows there will not be a speech from me.

Mr. WHEELER. I should like to have a speech from the Senator in his own time.

Mr. McCARRAN. I should merely like to know from the Senator from Kentucky who propounded the question that he read from the record?

Mr. BARKLEY. I did.

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator from Kentucky representing the administration. Is that correct?

Mr. BARKLEY. I am not saying whether I represented it or not.

Mr. WHEELER. As Democratic leader.

Mr. BARKLEY. I suppose I could not be condemned if I admit that I represented it.

Mr. McCARRAN. I do not think the Senator could be condemned in his own mind.

Mr. BARKLEY. I hope the mere fact that I represent the administration here would not condemn me in the mind of the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. McCARRAN. I hope not.

Mr. WHEELER. Let me read from a letter from a boy living in Fairfield, Ill., who says:

This manpower situation seems to be giving Congress a great deal of trouble at the present time. Speaking for myself and thousands of men in my category, may I offer the following:

Approximately a year ago I was rejected by the Army because of a minor spinal ailment. Since that time I have appealed to my local board several times for another chance; but as you know they act indirectly upon your orders.

Yes, I'm supposed to be doing my part for the war effort. Some days I work a little, other days I sit around and wait for the whistle.

He is a worker in industry.

If this is helping to win the war, then I offer my sincere apologies for this letter.

I feel that somewhere there is a more important job for us. Couldn't a bill be introduced into Congress to draft IV-F men with minor physical ailments? Maybe we wouldn't be fit for combat service; but couldn't we relieve some men in this country for actual combat? Fellows like myself feel it is our duty and responsibility to do all in our power to help preserve the freedom and way of living that we Americans love so much.

I realize that you receive many letters each day regarding such problems as the one I have discussed; that it would be utterly impossible to act upon each one.

The letter is addressed to a Representative in Congress from Illinois.

Here is a letter from the Office of Strategic Services. I wish to call it to the attention of the Senator from Alabama who has asked me to give names. The writer of the letter says:

DEAR SENATOR WHEELER: I have been following the debate between yourself and the advocates of the bill to draft fathers. It is best that I state here I have no interest in whether or not the bill is passed or defeated since it will not affect me one way or the other because even though I am a father, I am already in the Army. What does concern me, however, is the fact that after volunteering for the armed forces to help get rid of our enemies, I find myself pushing a typewriter around in the Office of Strategic Services.

I know some one must do this type of work, but why they picked on me is something I will never understand. After reading my typewriting you will understand what I mean. To make matters worse there are thousands of young men in this Office, and for that matter hundreds of other offices, who are within the combat age and who are disgusted with their present assignments but cannot do a thing to remedy their predicaments. If the War Department or the Selective Service Board needs more men I suggest they look in the Q building of the office on the letter head.

Without exaggerating there are enough Brass-Hat Commandos in this office to replace every warrior injured in the Sicilian campaign.

There are more deferred civilians doing nothing of importance than all of the other departments of the Federal Government.

P. S.—Please keep my name confidential.

He signs the letter, but asks that his name be kept confidential, and the Senate can understand why.

I have here a letter from the Center Chamber of Commerce, of Center, Tex. It is marked "Personal," and I shall not give the name of the writer. He says:

DEAR SENATOR WHEELER: A Democrat throughout life, born and reared in Texas—a member of the draft board in the First World War and until recently a member of the so-called Selective Service Board of Shelby County. Resigned more than 60 days since and that resignation was due to the vacillating policy and incompetency at Washington and State headquarters at Austin. Hot air broadcasting out of Washington not understood either by the broadcaster or the people, causing confusion and unrest amongst the people and needless trouble for the boards.

Am not in the habit of writing even Texas Senators, yet I want to add my endorsement to your stand on the induction of fathers into the armed forces. The issue is not the induction of fathers so much as it is making fatherless children at the most critical period of the child's life, second making wholesale disruption of business, practically destroying the home front, vastly decreasing the source of revenue so badly needed and this at the behest of Army officers, a majority of whom hadn't the imagination to conceive, even in part, the magnitude of aircraft in wars and then even after Germany struck Poland. Again, what could tie us closer to Mexico, Brazil, and other South American countries than for their armies to fight side by side with the armed forces of the United States? This war has dispelled

the idea that we are the only pebble on the beach and that when properly trained and equipped the Chinese is a better fighter than the Jap.

Cost plus is the most damnable business proposition ever perpetrated on the American people. At several shipbuilding plants on the Gulf coast of Texas and not more than 175 miles of this place are at least 2,500 Shelby County farmers drawing ungodly wages and most of them home on week ends and joke about the vast number of unnecessary men employed by these plants—the bigger the pay roll the more the "pluses" and the more for the racketeer labor leader. As Baruch says, that if these plants were on contract basis and forced to organize their manpower the manpower situation would clear up in a jiffy.

I now wish to quote from a letter written by a man who lives in New York City:

I have been employed in a secondary war plant and in said plant there was employed about 20 refugees, all single, and well within the draft age. About 3 days a week a lawyer was in the factory making out deferments for these boys. I had charge of a certain department and the boss brought in a young man to me and said I had to give him a job as he was in the draft, and his father was a personal friend of said boss.

All of the work done by these young men could be done by older men, a better job with a little more money, but the company could not see it that way.

Now I shall read an article concerning an incident in Spring Valley, N. Y.:

Charles W. Hawkins, president of the First National Bank of Spring Valley, has resigned as a member of the Ramapo Selective Service Board in protest against drafting any fathers unless more adequate provision is made for their families and until what he calls the "rat file" of available single men is cleared.

"If we have to take the married men, which is indicated will be the practice," Mr. Hawkins said today, "we must have more relief. The wife of a married man with 3 children now gets \$82 a month and she can't make it with having to pay the rent, food, and clothing, not to consider illness.

"The married men in the services with children are constantly worrying about their families. If our people are willing to place the responsibility on a fellow citizen to select fellow citizens for the armed services, why not let that person determine what adequate compensation should be for the families of married draftees with children?

"It might cost a few dollars more but the soldiers at least would be relieved of the worries they are now going through which I as a banker and as a member of the draft board know they are suffering."

Turning to the "rat-file" cases, Mr. Hawkins said it was composed mostly of single young men "who put everything in the path of the draft board not to be inducted." He said this file is not over large but too big.

He spoke of one man who obtained deferment as a "farmer" because he had "a few fruit trees" in his yard although he actually has a job in New York. He said there are a good many who hide behind the farmer clause who are not farmers.

Why did we pass a law exempting farmers? It is said that fathers should not be deferred because they have no organization; but we deferred farmers, although the War Department was opposed to it, and the Navy Department was opposed to it.

Mr. HILL. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The War Department and the Navy Department did not oppose the Tydings amendment, which was enacted into law. The Selective Service drafted the amendment. The Navy Department did oppose the so-called Bankhead bill, which did not become law, which died in the House of Representatives, but the Tydings amendment, under which agricultural workers are today being deferred, was not opposed by either the Army or the Navy. On the contrary, it was prepared by the Selective Service.

Mr. WHEELER. The Army and the Navy came here and opposed the proposal before the Committee on Agriculture, and General McNarney testified against it.

Mr. HILL. Agricultural workers are deferred under the Tydings amendment, and the Army and the Navy did not oppose that amendment, and the Selective Service prepared the language of the amendment.

Mr. WHEELER. General Hershey and General McNarney appeared before the Committee on Agriculture and opposed the deferring of farm boys, and testified against the bill.

Mr. HILL. Not the Tydings amendment.

Mr. WHEELER. Just a moment; later on, when the matter passed out of the committee, where there was not a single vote against it, and came onto the floor of the Senate, the officers of the Army came here and as a compromise agreed, as I understand, to take the Tydings amendment, but they were unalterably opposed to the proposal before the Committee on Agriculture, and testified before that committee against it.

Mr. HILL. Their testimony before the Committee on Agriculture was after January 1, and we enacted the Tydings amendment the year before, at the time when we considered the drafting of 18- and 19-year-old boys. Their testimony was subsequent to the adoption of the Tydings amendment.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I have here a telegram from Holyoke, Mass., reading as follows:

SEPTEMBER 21, 1943.

The following article appears in tonight's Holyoke Transcript under a Springfield date line:

"SPRINGFIELD DRAFT BOARD MEMBER QUILTS IN PROTEST

"SPRINGFIELD.—Joseph E. Kerigan, Springfield lawyer, resigned from draft board No. 143 today in protest against what he termed the repeated draft deferments of young unmarried men on the ground that they are essential to industry

"I feel that I can no longer serve in a system which permits repeated draft deferments of unmarried men in their twenties and early thirties while we are being forced to induct married men and, worse still, married men with children," he said in his letter of resignation to Gov. Leverett Saltonstall.

"Kerigan said the system in effect in Massachusetts permits employers to select single men whom they desire to retain. This, he said, has built up a situation where young men who never had any industrial experience suddenly become indispensable men, either through the desire of the employer to keep hold on or by obvious covering up by influential relatives or friends in the plant."

"The picture, Behind the Rising Sun, is now showing at one of the local show houses. General Marshall can select from 200 to 500 young men from 18 to 25 years of age any evening by walking down the street on inspection. These young men are in line trying to get into the theater.

"Joseph Kerigan, as mentioned above, has the correct analysis, and, beyond a doubt, a congressional investigation would show that the same condition exists in every State and city. Let us not be too hasty in upsetting the family life of 475,000 additional young American homes just because some Army general makes such a demand."

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Does the Senator from Montana know anything about what has become of the inventory which is supposed to be made all over the country, which will not, as I understand, be completed until September 30, and under which, according to the evidence of some of the draft boards which have written me about it, they are picking up many men who have been improperly classified or whose status has changed?

Mr. WHEELER. I do not know.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I have a letter from the chairman of a voluntary organization composed of all the draft boards in St. Louis County, Mo., in which he writes:

The 1st of this month we started an inventory of the first two registrations. That inventory is to give a complete history and also in that inventory will be listed the number of children that each married man with children has according to our records.

That record will not be complete until September 30, if then. Instructions are to send the original direct to Hershey at Washington and a copy to State headquarters.

In the inventory we are taking the boards are finding an opportunity for quite a few pick-ups of men who have probably been missed or have been classified incorrectly or whose status has changed or any of many things that can occur. This all over the country with a check-up of that type should be able to pick up quite a few men.

Mr. President, it seems to me the picture we have been given here may not be a correct one until that inventory has been completed and an effort made to find men who are possibly not in classification I-A who ought to be in classification I-A. It seems to me no effort has been made to establish a national pool of men who should be in class I-A, as has been done in the case to which the letter refers with respect to a local pool of men in class I-A, and we cannot know, until such inventory is completed, who should be in class I-A.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for his contribution. He is entirely correct in his statement.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I may say that I have received similar observations from members of draft boards in my State who are certainly in a better position to know the situation, being in the field, than is anyone in the War Department.

Mr. WHEELER. Let me say to the Senator that I have received at least a hundred letters, which are now in my file, from various draft boards throughout the country, many from outside my

State, and many within my State, complaining about the drafting of fathers because there has not been a check-up, and for that reason they are opposed to the drafting of fathers.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. I wish to say that I personally know Mr. Kerigan, whose name was mentioned in the telegram the Senator has just read. He is a very honorable and high-class citizen, and a lawyer of marked ability of the city of Springfield.

In view of the fact that the Senator is presenting evidence from members of draft boards, I should like to have the Senator request that the clerk read a letter which I have received from a member of one of the draft boards of my State which deals with the same subject matter the Senator has presented.

Mr. WHEELER. I shall be glad to do so.

Mr. President, I send to the desk the letter from a member of a draft board in Boston, Mass., and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURROCK in the chair). Without objection the clerk will read as requested.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

UNIVERSAL TEXTILE CORPORATION,  
Boston, Mass., September 23, 1943.  
Senator DAVID I. WALSH,

Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: On the question of drafting fathers, the issue is not that the requirements of the armed services should be met, rather should fathers be drafted while so many single men are deferred. As a member of a local board from the start of selective service, I would like to present my concern in the matter, and these are my own personal views and not necessarily the view of the board to which I belong.

If, and when, the single men are inducted who could be used with the least amount of dislocation to the family unit and industry, then and only then should fathers be taken. I submit that you can't in conscience take fathers until you have exhausted the following groups:

1. The 18-year-olds who ducked into college last spring indicating that they were to major in a science and who thereby, at the insistence of national headquarters, gained a deferment until July 1, 1945.

2. The 18 to 28 single men in war industry who entered their present employment with no particular qualifications for the jobs they now hold and about whom now there exists serious question as to both their necessity and irreplaceability. "Replacement schedules" have not solved this, and in reality we have almost double these deferments since State headquarters took this over from the local boards. Include here governmental employees.

3. The single men IV-F, psychoneurosis, anxiety type, rejected at the induction station, should be utilized by the services in other than combat service or released to war work only, in the manner of the older men being released. This group in civilian life has a demoralizing effect to civilian life also, because the anxiety is not too apparent.

In addition to the above groups, I believe the services are at fault in their educational program which in itself we believe is a good thing but untimely. When it becomes necessary to substitute fathers, particularly those in their thirties for these young men, I submit that a father is called upon to pay a pretty high price for the education of some

youth, particularly where the education is general in character and not tied in closely to the requirements of the armed services. In view of the statements with reference to the immediate requirements of the services for manpower, I question seriously the propriety of such a program now.

I do not believe that the figures released by General Hershey to prove the necessity of drafting 446,000 fathers are convincing. The figures as of July 1, 1943, showed available in class I, 1,566,000, and they state this would result in only one-half being accepted, or 783,000. The total rejects in IV-F for all reasons, including rejects at induction, only amounts to 27 percent, and I doubt very much that the experience of any of the induction stations results in a 50-percent rejection.

I list below some of the points which bear indirectly on the subject of drafting fathers:

1. A strict interpretation of the regulations as they now stand would preclude the shifting now of fathers from nonessential civilian employment to essential work because they could not qualify under the definition of "necessary man." If draft boards are to be lenient the regulations should so state.

2. The method of reclassifying fathers by order numbers only, without regard to the degree of hardship involved, dependency, age, dislocation of civilian economy, etc., is wrong. The varying degrees of dependency have been scrapped except where utter destitution would result and a registrant could qualify for III-D. Is it not desirable to take first the father where little or no dependency exists before the father of a large family, the employer of many people, the older fathers, etc.? Why not use some selectivity in considering fathers.

3. We are drifting away from the original aims, purposes, and set-up of the selective-service laws. More and more encroachment is made upon the authority of the local board to select. The administration was to have been civilian in character. Such phrases as "maintenance of the family as a unit" are being discarded. Coercion by manpower (called "voluntary cooperation") through selective service, undermines.

I was prompted to write to you because in reading of the hearings now in progress, it seemed that the real issues were not being brought out. Further, I thought that the views of one actively engaged in the administration of the selective-service laws might furnish you with ideas not commonly presented.

I trust that you are very well and with kindest regards.

Very truly yours,

JAMES A. WALSH.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I desire to read into the RECORD a telegram, at the request of the American Legion. It is as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., September 28, 1943.  
Hon. LISTER HILL,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.:

The American Legion at its national convention held at Omaha last week adopted a resolution with respect to manpower army, reading as follows:

"The Chief of Staff has stated that 7,700,000 men are needed by December 31, 1943. As this figure has been based upon a definite strategic plan and worked out by the experts, any authority who undertakes to change this figure, recommended as a minimum for the plan envisaged, must assume the responsibility for the effect upon the plan which may result from such change."

I feel certain the Senate would want Legion's viewpoint on this vital subject. Would appreciate your inserting our resolution in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

FRANCIS M. SULLIVAN,  
Executive Director, National Legisla-  
tive Committee, the American  
Legion.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, because of the interruptions which have occurred this afternoon, I shall need considerably more time in order to complete my statement with reference to the pending bill. I felt I probably should be able to finish this afternoon; but because of the interruptions I have not been able to do so. I promised the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKellar] that I would let him bring up a measure in which he and other Senators are vitally interested. So at this time I shall conclude, but with the understanding, I hope, that I may proceed tomorrow.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is entirely agreeable, so far as I am concerned.

#### EMERGENCY MATERNITY AND INFANT CARE FOR WIVES OF ENLISTED MEN

Mr. McKellar. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House Joint Resolution 159.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be read by title, for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 159) making additional appropriations for the fiscal year 1944 for emergency maternity and infant care for wives of enlisted men in the armed forces.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. McNary. Mr. President, I have no objection to the immediate consideration of the joint resolution. I desire to ask the able Senator in charge of the joint resolution if it is a replica of the joint resolution which passed the House.

Mr. McKellar. It is. My recollection is that the Senate committee was entirely unanimous in its recommendation of the joint resolution. So far as I know, there are no objections to it. Certain amendments were added by the House.

In explanation, let me say that the Senator will recall that a provision similar to that proposed by the joint resolution was included in the 1943 deficiency appropriation bill. At first only \$1,200,000 was appropriated. Later, an additional \$4,400,000 was appropriated. All that money has been used by the various States for the purposes provided in the bill, which is for emergency maternity and infant care of the wives of enlisted men now in the armed forces.

It is now reported by the Department that for the remainder of the fiscal year \$18,620,000 will be required, to be allotted and turned over to the various State boards of health for administration. The administration work is done almost entirely by the boards. Only \$20,000 will be for administration by the central office in Washington. The Federal Government furnishes all the money to the

States, and it is administered by the States.

The measure is one which I think we all feel should pass. The purposes of the joint resolution are very worthy. In addition, let me say that I think the service is being very fairly and justly provided throughout the country.

Mr. President, I hope that the joint resolution may pass.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Tennessee?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 159) making additional appropriations for the fiscal year 1944 for emergency maternity and infant care for wives of enlisted men in the armed forces.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, the purpose of the joint resolution is one in which I have had considerable interest, and of which I am definitely in favor, and so stated in connection with the previous appropriation when it came before the Senate. However, I should like to address one or two questions to the Senator in charge of the measure, if I may do so.

Mr. McKellar. Certainly.

Mr. BURTON. As I understand, the theory is that the Government will provide the actual care for the wives of enlisted men, and it is not a matter of providing them with the actual money. It was thought that in following that policy we would thereby cut the expense approximately in half. Is that correct?

Mr. McKellar. The Senator is entirely correct. I think the savings are greater than that. I think the actual total expense for each patient is \$84.50; and, from what I have heard, to my mind that is a very reasonable price for the service performed.

Mr. BURTON. As I understand, there has been some difference of opinion as to whether that was the right way to approach the matter. However, that is the way we approached it in the first instance, and the pending joint resolution merely provides a continuation of the policy already adopted; is that true?

Mr. McKellar. That is true. The joint resolution merely provides for a continuation of the policy; it would not change it in the slightest. The matter is entirely in the hands of the several States, and the plan is working admirably, according to the reports, and as stated in the hearings.

Mr. BURTON. Let me ask a further question. Is it the opinion of the Senator that the appropriation provided by the joint resolution will be sufficient to carry on the work through the entire year? Let me add, before the Senator answers that question, the following estimate: As I understand, it is roughly estimated that there will be approximately 600,000 cases of births to wives of enlisted men, and it is estimated that approximately one-half of those would come under the joint resolution, which would make approximately 300,000 cases for the remainder of the year.

Mr. McKellar. Yes.

Mr. BURTON. I notice that in many of the larger States, such as Pennsylvania, Texas, Oregon, North Dakota, and Louisiana, by the end of August no applications whatever had been made; and in such States as Ohio and New York the applications were still in small numbers. Is it the estimate of the Senator that there will be a sufficient amount to take care of the great increase which will come about as the States begin to make their applications?

Mr. McKellar. Mr. President, all I can say is that in the opinion of those in charge of the national administration of the service, in the Department of Labor, the amount carried in the joint resolution will be sufficient. However, when we realize that we started with \$1,200,000 and then added \$4,400,000, which total sum has lasted less than 6 months, we cannot say positively about it. We shall have to take our chances. I hope it will be sufficient.

Mr. BURTON. It is for that reason that I wish to urge this point on the Senator: If there are to be 600,000 cases, and if the appropriation carried by the joint resolution will cover only approximately 300,000 cases, as a maximum, for the year, if there were applications for more than one-half of the cases, to be handled under these funds, it then would be necessary to increase the appropriation. Would the Senator then proceed on the same theory, that it should be done?

Mr. McKellar. I certainly would. I think it is nothing but humanity. I do not see how the Congress could afford to turn down an appropriation of this kind.

Mr. REED and Mr. BARKLEY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. McKellar. I yield first to the Senator from Kansas, and then to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, as I understand the theory of the measure, it is to provide assistance to the wives of servicemen in bringing their babies into the world.

Mr. McKellar. That is true.

Mr. REED. That being the case, notwithstanding the great talent and wide experience of the Senator from Tennessee, I wonder if the ranking bachelor of the Senate is fully qualified to handle a measure of this character. [Laughter.]

Mr. McKellar. I doubt it very much. I want to say that, not having any personal experience in such matters, I can handle it in only an impersonal way. However, I think it is a great humanitarian service. The fathers of the children who are being born are away fighting for their country, and I think the Congress ought to appropriate the necessary money to carry the mothers through their ordeal.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKellar. I yield.

Mr. REED. Notwithstanding the great dereliction in the Senator's duty to humanity and to his country in all the

years of his existence, he is doing a good job now. [Laughter.]

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator for that compliment. It is not my fault, but merely my misfortune. I have courted many women, and they all had the good sense to turn me down. [Laughter.]

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I dislike very much to challenge the statement made by my good friend the Senator from Tennessee, but at least three women have specifically and definitely denied that statement.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am sorry I did not know about it sooner. [Laughter.]

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have received only one complaint about the way in which this fund and this service are being administered. I have received a letter from a prominent county officer in my State, who explained that when the wives of enlisted men are taken into the hospital they are taken in as charity patients, and are so regarded in the hospital. Probably he was referring only to his county, and perhaps only to one case. At any rate, it seems that his attention has been directed to what he thinks is a mistaken policy in the administration of the fund. I do not know under what conditions that would be true. The fund is being administered locally by the State, I suppose, under regulations worked out through the State authorities.

Mr. McKELLAR. Under regulations worked out through the State authorities, and approved by the Board here.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not understand why any soldier's wife who is going to a hospital for the birth of a child should be received as a charity patient. It seems to me that if there is any such practice as that it ought to be corrected, because the wives of soldiers ought not to come in that category. In a very real sense of the word, they are not charity patients. We are rendering the service as a matter of justice. We are doing it because we think they and their husbands in the Army are entitled to the service, just as they are entitled to compensation.

Mr. McKELLAR. Of course.

Mr. BARKLEY. If there is anyone in the Federal Government or in the State government who is shortsighted enough or casual enough, or for any other reason, designates these patients as charity patients, that practice ought to be corrected.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I think the correspondent of the Senator must be mistaken. I have never heard of such charges before, and it must not be correct. The service is part of the compensation to the soldier who is fighting for his country, and in no sense should it be regarded as charity.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BURTON. It is a fact, is it not, that any wife of an enlisted man may obtain this service, entirely regardless of her financial situation? She has only to

file an application, and the service is then granted. The service does not depend in any way upon a showing of the need for charity, and she is not required to show that the service must be given to her because she is short of funds.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator is entirely correct.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I think the misunderstanding has arisen because, as I understand, the service given in hospitals is only ward service. It is not private-room service. However, that has nothing to do with the question whether it is charity or not. It may be that in some cases the patients have been placed in wards with charity patients.

Mr. McKELLAR. That depends entirely upon the rules laid down in the particular State, and approved by the department in Washington.

Mr. TAFT. As I understand, in Ohio the service given is only ward service, and there are included the services of a physician, up to \$40. If a patient wishes to employ a doctor who charges more than \$40, she does not have the advantage of this particular service. At least that is the fact in Ohio.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think the various State authorities take the greatest care to see that each of the patients receives the very best care and attention. The Senate and the country should know that to be a fact.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BURTON. As I understand, this service covers prenatal service as well as service at the time of the birth, and also care of the child during the first year, so far as it may need medical care.

Mr. McKELLAR. I believe that is correct.

Mr. BURTON. For that reason, because of the value of the service and the soundness of the principle, it seems to me quite likely that long before the year has passed, there may be more than one-half of the wives of enlisted men applying for this service, and that may result in an additional request for appropriations. I think the Senate should be ready to grant the request if additional applications are made.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have no doubt that that will be done. I hope that additional appropriations will not be necessary, because our obligations are growing very rapidly, and we hope to save all we can, but not in this connection, because whatever the needs of this particular service are, I have no doubt that Congress will furnish the necessary money.

Mr. BURTON. Let me ask the Senator to confirm these inquiries also:

May the patient choose her own doctor?

Mr. McKELLAR. That is my understanding.

Mr. BURTON. And in case of serious illness arising in connection with the birth, is she able to obtain the benefit of additional specialized services?

Mr. McKELLAR. I am not sure about that, but I believe that is correct.

Mr. BURTON. And that is also included in the expense which the Government assumes?

Mr. McKELLAR. My attention is directed to a statement concerning the program. I wish to read a portion of it:

The program provides for complete maternity care and care for the infant during the first year of life. In all States, the wives of servicemen may select their own physicians; decision with respect to hospital care rests with the physician and the patient. Any hospital may be used provided it has been approved by the State health agency. If during the period when a wife of an enlisted man is receiving maternity care there is need for the consultation of specialists, including surgeons, for blood transfusions, X-ray examinations, special nursing or prolonged hospital care, these services may be paid for under the program.

This program is administered by the State health agencies and every effort is made to assure all possible care for each wife of an enlisted man during pregnancy, delivery, and the postnatal period. In the same way special care for the newborn baby can be provided if needed and also throughout the first year of its life.

That answers the question of the Senator.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the entire statement printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The emergency maternity and infant-care program provides that payments for medical service to the wives and infants of enlisted men be made by the State health agencies to physicians, hospitals, and others providing care. In passing the act providing for this service, the Congress made clear that the purpose of the program was to provide this care in order to assure the enlisted men that their wives and infants would be cared for in their absence. It is important, therefore, that no modification of the program be written into the appropriation act that would remove this assurance.

Forty-seven States, including Alaska, Hawaii, and the District of Columbia, are co-operating. The four other States are expected to have programs soon.

The program provides for complete maternity care and care for the infant during the first year of life. In all States the wives of servicemen may select their own physicians; decision with respect to hospital care rests with the physician and the patient. Any hospital may be used provided it has been approved by the State health agency. If during the period when a wife of an enlisted man is receiving maternity care there is need for the consultation of specialists, including surgeons, for blood transfusions, X-ray examinations, special nursing, or prolonged hospital care, these services may be paid for under the program.

This program is administered by the State health agencies and every effort is made to assure all possible care for each wife of an enlisted man during pregnancy, delivery, and the postnatal period. In the same way special care for the newborn baby can be provided if needed and also throughout the first year of its life.

PROPOSAL TO CHANGE FROM A PROGRAM OF PROVISION OF MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICES TO FLAT ALLOWANCE OR GRANTS DIRECTLY TO THE WIVES OF ENLISTED MEN

Such a proposal to change the plan of providing care from one of payment for services

to one of flat allowances to the wives of servicemen was proposed in the House of Representatives and an amendment offered by Congressman SMITH of Ohio. This amendment (see p. 7767), CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 22, 1943) was fully discussed and defeated by a vote of 8 to 115 (see p. 7770). Should a money grant or cash allowance for purchase of maternity and infant care be adopted, the purposes of the program as passed by the Congress could not be effectively carried out for the following reasons:

1. There would be no assurance that such a cash grant or allowance would be expended by the wives of servicemen for the purpose for which the program was initiated by Congress, namely, medical and hospital care for the wives of enlisted men. In many cases such grants would be expended by the recipient to meet immediate needs at the time the cash is received and adequate care by physician and hospital at time of delivery might no longer be possible.

2. The cost of the total program would be far greater than under the present plan. It is estimated today that some 645,000 wives of enlisted men will have babies during the current fiscal year, and that approximately half of this number will apply for care under the program. Were the plan for money grants to be adopted, all wives of enlisted men in grades 4, 5, 6, and 7 would presumably be entitled to receive them. This would mean, if a grant of approximately \$100 was made to each wife, that the program would cost at least \$30,000,000 more than is estimated at the present time.

3. A flat grant would necessarily be made without regard to individual medical need or the cost of care. In many cases a grant would not be sufficient to cover extraordinary medical expenses, either for the mother or infant such as are being provided under the program today.

4. Under such a plan of grants, though an individual wife might have money with which to purchase medical service, she still might be unable to obtain the necessary care where there is no public agency responsible for making services available. This would be true particularly in communities suffering from the impact of war and consequent shortage of personnel and medical facilities. Under the existing plan it is the responsibility of State health agencies to see that care is made available to the wives of servicemen through the development of appropriate plans.

5. The flat grant would be available for the wife to apply on her medical and hospital bills but there would be no assurance that the rates charged by doctor and hospital would be within the cash grant.

Mr. BURTON. I have a further inquiry:

In cases in which a State or community has built up a special prenatal care service for young mothers, may they still make use of this governmental service at the time of the birth?

Mr. McKELLAR. That may be done.

Mr. BURTON. Finally, as I understand the joint resolution, the service will not be available to all enlisted men, as was provided in the previous measure. It will be limited to the fourth, fifth, sixth, and seventh grades, thereby eliminating the three higher grades, the first, second, and third grades. However, even a person in one of those grades who has made application for the service and whose application has been approved, will be permitted to continue with the service. Is that correct?

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I notice from page 3 of the report that there have been no cases in the State of North Dakota. If the joint resolution is passed, will it be retroactive?

Mr. McKELLAR. The State may take advantage of the service at any time it wishes to do so. Let me read from page 2 of the report:

Louisiana and North Dakota have not submitted plans, but North Dakota has indicated its intention to do so.

I am sure it will do so, and it will receive all the benefits of the act.

Mr. LANGER. As I understand, there is no rule or regulation which would prevent any child previously conceived in North Dakota from receiving the benefits of the act, in case North Dakota should later qualify under the act.

Mr. McKELLAR. The service is not based upon the time of conception, but upon the time of birth. I am quite sure that all cases will be taken care of as they occur, if North Dakota should ask for the service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution is before the Senate and open to amendment. If there be no amendments to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 159) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BACK THE ATTACK ARMY SHOW—ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES F. BYRNES

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, on Sunday, September 26, at the closing performance of the Back the Attack Army show held at the Monument grounds here in Washington, Hon. James Byrnes, Director of War Mobilization, a distinguished son of South Carolina, was asked to make the concluding speech. I shall later ask that this excellent speech be included in the RECORD as a part of my remarks. At this time, Mr. President, I wish to say just a word about the Back the Attack show itself. It was sponsored by a newspaper which has been prominent in American life for many years—the Washington Post. The owner and editor of that newspaper, Mr. Eugene Meyer, and the managing editor, Mr. Alexander F. Jones, are to be greatly commended for their patriotic endeavor to bring to the attention of the people of Washington and the visitors here at least a few of the many outstanding things the Army is doing in connection with the war.

It was a most enlightening show and exhibition. It was not only entertaining, but very instructive. Exhibitions were given by soldiers, and their performances were exceedingly well done. Anyone not having seen this show can hardly comprehend the vast activities of the Army in this war effort. The effective and material activities of the Army were well represented—great guns which can be easily transported and maneuvered; large tanks which are none other than land battleships, and which can be moved with swiftness and effectiveness,

and so forth. Whether the activities are on foot, wheels, horseback, or dog team, they are being handled most efficiently. The Medical Corps is most expertly managed, and all facilities for the comfort of the soldier are streamlined to the nth degree. It is a show that the whole country should have had an opportunity to witness. I again compliment the Washington Post for conceiving the thought of such a worthwhile undertaking. I am sure that I speak for the more than 1,700,000 people who witnessed this show and its exhibits when I say that it was worth while, instructive, enlightening, and from every angle beneficial in educating the public on the Army war activities.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the address delivered by Mr. Byrnes be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am authorized to announce that the sale of bonds during the Third War Loan drive through last night totaled \$13,300,000,000. Of this amount individuals have bought \$2,800,000,000. This represents 56 percent of the goal set for individuals.

Tonight my appeal is directed to individual Americans—the average American citizens who, as they work in shipyards, munitions plants, airplane factories, on our farms, or elsewhere, are making more money than ever before. With an increasing amount of our available manpower going into the war effort we are unable to produce for civilian use as much goods and services as we did before the war. We have more money but less goods. If we scramble to get more than our fair share of the available goods, our efforts to hold down the cost of living will fail. Prices will rise, and the money we earn will buy less and less of the things we really need.

Wars are won by sacrifices. Unless you are making some sacrifice here at home to help win the war you are not keeping faith with those brave Americans who are fighting and who are making the supreme sacrifice in Italy, in New Guinea, and on our far-flung battlefields.

Buying bonds in itself is no sacrifice. Only when you deny to yourself every-day pleasures and comforts in order to buy bonds do you make any sacrifice. But then the sacrifice is only momentary, because in the long run you profit by putting your money in War bonds. They pay interest, and there is no better investment than the bonds of your own Government. Purchases by big financial institutions prove that. When the men who manage these institutions put their money in bonds you know it is a good investment for you to make. When you really need your money you will get it back with interest.

More important, these bonds in the hands of individual Americans will serve as a cushion against any shock which our national life may experience as we convert from a war economy to a peace economy.

Foolish indeed is the man who when the sun is shining does not save money for a rainy day. As never before, the sunshine of high wages and spendable income is bearing down throughout this land. Our national annual income is approaching the all-time high level of \$150,000,000,000.

It is estimated that in the coming year after buying all available goods and services, and after paying all personal taxes, individual Americans will have over \$40,000,000,000 to invest or spend. If we spend this surplus money, bidding up prices in an effort to get more than our fair share of the available

goods, it will be impossible to hold ceiling prices. We will make black markets. We will start an inflation spiral that will impoverish the people.

It is only common sense to invest a large portion of this \$40,000,000,000 in War bonds and hold them for the rainy day. If, when the war is over, we have a business depression, the bonds will insure you against want. If—as all of us hope—good times continue, the bonds can be used to purchase those things which will make for a higher standard of living.

You cannot go wrong. You cannot lose. You can only profit by investing every spare dollar in the bonds of your Government. It is the least sacrifice a patriotic American can make to help win the war.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

#### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

#### EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. KILGORE, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Leslie E. Given, of West Virginia, to be United States attorney for the southern district of West Virginia, vice Lemuel R. Via, term expired.

By Mr. VAN NUYS, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

J. Henry Goguen, of Massachusetts, to be United States marshal for the district of Massachusetts;

John J. Farrell, of Minnesota, to be United States marshal for the district of Minnesota; and

James H. Patterson, of Alaska, to be United States marshal for division No. 3, district of Alaska.

By Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Guy T. Helvering, of Kansas, to be United States district judge for the district of Kansas, vice Richard J. Hopkins, deceased.

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Harry E. Pratt, of Alaska, to be United States district judge, division No. 4, district of Alaska; and

Ellen K. Raedy, of the District of Columbia, to be associate judge of the municipal court for the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

John J. Boyle, of Wisconsin, to be United States attorney for the western district of Wisconsin.

By Mr. McFARLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Frank E. Flynn, of Arizona, to be United States attorney for the district of Arizona.

By Mr. MURDOCK, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Charles E. Cassidy, of Hawaii, to be third judge of the first circuit, circuit courts, Territory of Hawaii, vice Harold E. Stafford, deceased.

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Rear Admiral DeWitt C. Ramsey to be Chief of the Bureau of Aeronautics in the Depart-

ment of the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral, for a term of 4 years.

Sundry officers for promotion, for temporary service, in the Navy;

Sundry officers for appointment and/or promotion in the Navy;

Sundry officers for promotion, for temporary service, in the Marine Corps; and

Sundry citizens and meritorious noncommissioned officers for appointment as second lieutenants in the Marine Corps.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

#### THE NAVY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

Mr. WALSH. I ask that the nominations in the Navy be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Navy nominations are confirmed en bloc.

#### FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Foreign Service.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the nominations in the Foreign Service be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Foreign Service nominations are confirmed en bloc.

#### COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Joseph A. Ziemba to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 39, with headquarters at Chicago, Ill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Martin R. Bradley to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 38, with headquarters at Detroit, Mich.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Bernice Pyke to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 41, with headquarters at Cleveland, Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

#### THE MARINE CORPS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of William H. Rupertus to be major general in the Marine Corps for temporary service from September 28, 1942.

Mr. WALSH. I ask that the nomination be confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Colonel Lemuel C. Shepherd, to be brigadier general in the Marine Corps for temporary service from September 16, 1942.

Mr. WALSH. I ask that the nomination be confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

#### THOMAS L. GATCH—NOMINATION REPORTED AND CONFIRMED

Mr. WALSH. From the Committee on Naval Affairs, I report favorably the nomination of Rear Admiral Thomas L. Gatch to be Judge Advocate General of the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral, for a term of 4 years, and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

In connection with the Naval Affairs Committee recommendation to the Senate that the nomination of Thomas L. Gatch to be a rear admiral and Judge Advocate General of the Navy for a period of 4 years be confirmed, I desire to state that he is a graduate of a distinguished law school; an attorney admitted to practice in the courts of the United States and of the District of Columbia, and has spent many years of duty in the Office of the Judge Advocate General of the Navy.

Prior to the attack on Pearl Harbor, he was Assistant to the Judge Advocate General of the Navy, stationed in Washington. Very shortly thereafter he was assigned to command one of the newest and finest battleships in our Navy. In October 1942, while his ship was escorting one of a group of carriers seeking the enemy, it was attacked by 3 waves of attacking planes, dive bombers and torpedo bombers in large numbers. When the last wave had passed, the guns of the battleship had 32 Jap planes to their credit and the ship had suffered only comparatively minor damage.

For his service in this battle Captain Gatch was awarded the Navy Cross. The citation accompanying the award states:

For distinguished service and for gallant and intrepid action in the line of his profession as commanding officer of a United States battleship during the Battle of Santa Cruz Islands October 26, 1942. While the task force to which his ship was attached was under heavy and sustained air attack, Captain Gatch boldly maneuvered his ship close to a United States aircraft carrier in order to carry out more effectively his mission to assist in the defense of the carrier, and so continued until he was so seriously wounded from the explosion of an enemy bomb as to have to turn over his command.

Despite his wound, Captain Gatch wanted another shot at the enemy, and this was not long denied him. In the middle of November 1942 he fought with his ship in the victorious night battle of Savo Island. Here he earned the award of a Gold Star, in lieu of a second Navy Cross, for service described in the citation as follows:

For extraordinary heroism as commanding officer of a United States battleship during action against enemy Japanese forces off Savo Island on the night of November 14-15, 1942. Although partially disabled and suffering acute pain as a result of a previous wound, Captain Gatch, with bold determination and courageous zeal, gallantly fought his ship through a concentrated bombardment of hostile fire. His calm coolness in the

face of great danger and inspiring leadership contributed to the high combat efficiency which enabled the ship to sink at least one Japanese cruiser and to assist in the destruction and damage of other enemy vessels.

Among the officers and men who fought that engagement under Captain Gatch was a fine young naval officer whose proud father is the distinguished senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS].

On another occasion in these Halls my distinguished colleague retold the story of this great battle as told to him by his son, and I take the liberty of quoting from the account he then gave:

What a sterling leader this Captain Gatch. What a gallant captain he, who built up within his brave crew such a profound respect, such an abiding confidence, that they would sail willingly with him into the jaws of lurking death. Such leadership as this must not go uncited and unsung.

In consequence of his wound, Captain Gatch is perforce again on shore, at the important post of Judge Advocate General of the Navy.

In view of the distinguished record of Rear Admiral Thomas L. Gatch it is an honor for me to ask that the Senate suspend its rule and confirm his nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Rear Admiral Thomas L. Gatch to be Judge Advocate General of the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral, for a term of 4 years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the nomination? The Chair hears none, and the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. WALSH. I ask that the President be immediately notified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

#### NOMINATION OF GUY T. HELVERING TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE, KANSAS

Mr. REED. Mr. President, some time ago the President nominated, to fill a vacancy caused by the death of the sitting judge in the district court in Kansas, Guy T. Helvering, the present Commissioner of Internal Revenue. The nomination was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and a subcommittee reported the nomination unanimously, and the full committee has reported today favorably upon the nomination. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the nomination at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Guy T. Helvering to be United States district judge for the district of Kansas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request made by the junior Senator from Kansas? The Chair hears none, and the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, before the Senate votes to confirm the nomination of Mr. Guy T. Helvering as Federal District Judge for Kansas, I desire to

comment briefly on both Mr. Helvering and the Kansas judgeship.

In the first place, I want to say that I can and will vote for Mr. Helvering's confirmation, and will do so gladly. Mr. Helvering is not of the same political faith as myself; he is a Democrat. But he is a high-class man in every respect, one for whom I have had a very high regard for many years past. When he was nominated to be Commissioner of Internal Revenue more than 10 years ago, I actively supported his confirmation before the Senate Finance Committee and on the floor of the Senate. I said then he would make good as Internal Revenue Commissioner, and he has done so. I have no hesitation in saying that the President could have made no better choice among Kansas Democrats in the appointment of a district judge. Now as to the judgeship situation, for a number of years I have consistently opposed attempts to have an extra district judge for Kansas, on the ground that one able judge is sufficient to handle the cases that come under Federal jurisdiction in Kansas. The late Judge Richard J. Hopkins proved that by keeping up his docket in every respect. I feel confident that Judge Helvering will do the same thing.

Therefore I want to make it plain that my wholehearted support of Mr. Helvering for this high honor—an honor to which I believe his record of public service entitles him at the hands of the administration—is based in part upon the assumption that his services on the district bench will be such that there need be no more talk of a second Federal judicial district in the State of Kansas.

I express the hope and belief that Mr. Helvering will be confirmed by a unanimous vote.

Mr. President, I call attention to the following excerpts from an editorial by Mr. William Allen White in his *Emporia Gazette*:

#### JUDGE HELVERING

The President has named as successor to Judge Hopkins, Guy Helvering, who, for nearly a dozen years, has been the national collector of internal revenue. The Senate will quickly confirm him. It has been nearly a quarter of a century since Judge Helvering left the law and went into banking and graduated into politics, and finally into public service. Nevertheless, he was a good prosecuting attorney for 4 years, and has enough common sense and common morals to make a decent judge. No other Democrat in Kansas has such distinction as Guy Helvering and no other Democrat, on the whole, could fill the office with more credit to the Democratic Party and its traditions.

In the meantime, there should be no Democratic talk of a second judicial district in this State. One district is enough. Our Kansas Senators, in voting to confirm Guy Helvering, should give full and fair notice that in due and proper time they will oppose any attempt to make another district in Kansas.

In the meantime, citizens of Kansas of both parties should be glad that the judgeship in Kansas did not develop into an unnecessary fight and that as wise and honest a man as Guy Helvering has been appointed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

Mr. REED. I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be forthwith notified.

#### ORDER FOR RECESS

The Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I understand the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] desires to address the Senate for a few moments. I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of his address the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

#### FIRE PREVENTION IN THE WAR PROGRAM

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, the President of the United States has issued a proclamation designating the week beginning October 3, 1943, as Fire Prevention Week. In his proclamation the President points out that "this Nation's war program is menaced by an alarming increase in preventable fire losses." The President's proclamation reads as follows:

#### FIRE PREVENTION WEEK, 1943—BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA—A PROCLAMATION

This Nation's war program is menaced by an alarming increase in preventable fire losses. Since Pearl Harbor the destruction caused by fire in the United States has been comparable to the damage caused by all enemy bombing over England during the first 2 years of the war. The loss to this Nation is just as real as if the destruction had been wrought by enemy bombers over America, or by saboteurs.

These preventable fires are being measured in thousands of workers killed and disabled; vast destruction of critical raw materials, food, and other vital supplies for our armed forces and civilian population; the ruin of war plants, factories, homes, and machinery—in many cases for the duration of the war. Fires are bringing costly delays in the production and transportation of airplanes, ships, tanks, and guns—delays that mean a postponement of victory and the lives of many of our men on the fighting fronts.

Today it is vitally necessary that we prevent destructive fire. Every State in the Union shares this responsibility. Every community must make an extra and thorough effort to detect and eliminate fire hazards. Only by this united endeavor can America guard her productive power against fire and eliminate a major hazard that threatens seriously to reduce supplies of war materials, food, clothing, and other essentials required by our fighting men overseas and by our civilians at home. The cause was never so clear; the need was never so great.

Now, therefore, I, Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States of America, do hereby designate the week beginning October 3, 1943, as Fire Prevention Week. I earnestly request the people of the country to take unusually active measures during that week, and throughout the year, to conserve our human and material resources from destruction by fire. I call upon State and local governments, the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, the National Fire Waste Council, upon all business and labor organizations, the pulpit, educators, civic groups, the press, the radio, and the motion-picture industry to initiate programs that will vividly bring home to all our people the dangers of

fire and the methods of controlling it. Further, I direct the Office of Civilian Defense, the Department of Agriculture, the War Production Board, the protective services of the War and Navy Departments, and other appropriate Federal agencies to lend their active support and assistance to the attainment of these objectives.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

Done at the city of Washington this thirtieth day of August in the year of our Lord, nineteen hundred and forty-three, and of the independence of the United States of America the one hundred and sixty-eighth.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

By the President:

CORDELL HULL,

Secretary of State.

Mr. President, America's fire losses for the first 6 months of 1943 amounted to approximately \$190,514,000, as against a total loss for the year 1942 of \$314,295,000. Fire losses are increasing, and according to the National Fire Protection Association, the greater part of that increase is taking place in the Nation's war industries. At the present rate, the 1943 fire loss total may well exceed \$400,000,000.

These figures alone are a challenge to industry and labor to cooperate in the observance of Fire Prevention Week. But these figures alone do not begin to tell the full story of the meaning of fire losses in America.

Even if all this loss could be repaid in insurance, the money could not replace valuable war equipment; it could not restore the lives of workers lost in flaming buildings; it could not bring back the man-hours of labor lost on essential jobs; and it could not replace stock piles of rubber, lumber, or other critical materials which had been reduced to rubble.

Much has been said about the U-boat menace, and the tragedy of cargoes of munitions and foodstuffs being sent to the bottom of the seas. Such supplies—vital to the success of the war on all fronts—are just as irretrievably lost when they are destroyed anywhere along the line. Food, burned in barns or in warehouses; munitions, destroyed in the plant, in the railway terminal, or on the docks awaiting shipment, are a total loss to the United Nations. And the tragedy of such fire losses—as opposed to the losses directly traceable to enemy action—is that the great majority of them are preventable.

Fire protection in industry must be a cooperative effort between employees and management. Carelessness on the part of workers in the cleaning of machinery or in the handling of cigarettes or matches or in the segregation of materials has caused many costly fires. Management must maintain automatic sprinkler systems, fire extinguishers, and other fire-fighting equipment in and around industrial plants. Similarly, management must provide structural safeguards, which will help limit the destructive effects of fire—safeguards such as fire doors and fire-resistant roofs.

Cooperation is more essential today than ever before, because certain hazards, always incident to factories, have been increased by war. New workers are

operating machines and handling materials. Stocks are being concentrated in areas too confined to house them properly, and many plants have been expanded so rapidly that it has been almost impossible to provide them with adequate fire guards. Constant care and vigilance on the part of worker and management are, therefore, the first requisite to reducing industrial fire losses.

To the worker, to industry, and to the Nation, the reduction of industrial fire loss is essential. It means little for a plant to swing rapidly into maximum war production, if its facilities are later to be consumed by fire.

Mr. President, there were more large-loss industrial fires in 1942—our first year at war—than in any year of our history. And there were more large-loss industrial fires in the first 4 months of the present year, 1943, than in all of 1942.

While American and Allied troops rain their own brand of fire on the enemy abroad, American civilians have on their hands another kind of fight—a fight with fire on the home front. In spite of the fact that there has been remarkably little sabotage, and in spite of the fact that our cities have been free of incendiary bombing attacks, fire losses in our war industries have soared far beyond those of any similar period in our history.

Fire continues to take a yearly toll of thousands of lives and millions of dollars worth of food and equipment on our farms. Fire prevention is essential to conservation on the farm. Pointing out that America's fire losses are on the upgrade, and that farm fire losses—even in peacetime—amount to millions of dollars worth of materials and equipment annually, David J. Price, president of the National Fire Prevention Association, urges the complete cooperation of all farmers in the observance of Fire Prevention Week. And as Dr. Price points out, "Food burned in the barn is of no help to the fighting men overseas. The destruction of equipment by fire reduces the Nation's food-producing capacity," and thus delays the day of our ultimate military victory.

Today our residential fire loss is likewise appalling. The United States is burning its homes faster than they are being built. In 1942, approximately 350,000 dwelling units were constructed, in an all-out effort to solve this Nation's acute war-housing problem. During the same period, 395,000 dwelling units were attacked by fire—many of them totally destroyed. The great majority of these fires are the result of carelessness.

The elimination of fire hazards and the prosecution of a vigorous home-front war against fire destruction are the objectives of Fire Prevention Week. The control of fire is essential to the success of the war effort in all its phases—in attack, in supply, in conservation, and in the preservation of human lives.

Such common hazards as defective heating and electrical equipment, the misuse of gasoline and kerosene, careless disposal of matches and cigarettes, and the accumulation of flame-breeding rubbish, present no insuperable obstacle. But as long as such conditions are per-

mitted to exist, the danger of fire loss will likewise exist.

Fire Prevention Week is an appropriate time for all Americans to enlist in the struggle against fire—that sinister and deadly enemy which has infiltrated the home front. But after the battle is won, constant vigilance must be maintained, for fire is such a foe that it returns again and again, whenever the defenses against it are relaxed. It is up to the boys in uniform to start fires "over there" on the territory of the enemy. But it is up to us right here at home to stamp out our appalling fire losses, and in so doing to keep the wheels of our war effort moving along at maximum, uninterrupted speed.

I join with the President in calling upon every citizen in America to do his full part toward realizing these essential objectives, and toward making this National Fire Prevention Week a week of complete and effective fire-prevention accomplishments.

Let us join forces with those many thousands of our gallant citizens—the fire fighters of America—who by day and by night undergo the risks of pain and peril to protect America against the thrusts of fire. Let us strive to make a record contribution to the success of Fire Prevention Week.

#### RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the order previously adopted, the Senate will now stand in recess.

Thereupon (at 5 o'clock and 9 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Wednesday, September 29, 1943, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate September 28 (legislative day of September 15), 1943:

##### UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE

Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., of Virginia, to be Under Secretary of State.

##### DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

John W. Bailey, Jr., of Texas, to be a Foreign Service officer of class 3, a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, and a consul general of the United States of America.

##### APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO BE BRIGADIER GENERAL WITH RANK FROM 30 AUGUST 1943

Gen. Dwight David Eisenhower (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States, vice Brig. Gen. Richard C. Moore, appointed major general, Regular Army.

TO BE MAJOR GENERAL WITH RANK FROM 30 AUGUST 1943

Gen. Dwight David Eisenhower (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States, vice Major General William H. Wilson, retired.

##### TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

##### TO BE LIEUTENANT GENERALS

Maj. Gen. Hugh Aloysius Drum, United States Army, now invested with rank and title of lieutenant general by virtue of his assignment to command the First Army.

Maj. Gen. Ira Clarence Eaker (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Maj. Gen. Barton Kyle Yount (colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

#### TO BE MAJOR GENERALS

Brig. Gen. Harry John Collins (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Douglass Taft Greene (colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Ray Edison Porter (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. William Elmer Lynd (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. George Wesley Griner, Jr. (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. David McCoach, Jr. (colonel, Corps of Engineers), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Stephen J. Chamberlin (colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Robert Walker Grow (lieutenant colonel, Cavalry), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Shelley Uriah Marietta (colonel, Medical Corps), Assistant to the Surgeon General.

Brig. Gen. John Alden Crane (colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Joseph Nicholas Dalton (lieutenant colonel, Adjutant General's Department), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. George Fairless Lull (colonel, Medical Corps), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Stanley Eric Reinhart (lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Albert Walton Kenner (colonel, Medical Corps), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Lloyd Edmonstone Jones (colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Charles Paul Stivers (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. David Norvell Walker Grant (colonel, Medical Corps), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Robert Lily Spragins (colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. James Luke Frink (colonel, Quartermaster Corps), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Robert Hilliard Mills (colonel, Dental Corps), assistant to the Surgeon General.

Brig. Gen. Robert LeGrow Walsh (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

#### TO BE BRIGADIER GENERALS

Col. Thomas Francis Hickey (lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Col. Stuart Cutler (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Eric Spencer Molitor (lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Col. Edward Barber (major, Coast Artillery Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Paul Edmund Burrows (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Hubert Ward Beyette (lieutenant colonel, Quartermaster Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Charles Morris Ankorn (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Laurence Carbee Craigie (major, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Victor Vaughan Taylor (lieutenant colonel, Adjutant General's Department), Army of the United States.

Col. Merrick Gay Estabrook, Jr. (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. John Hamilton Hinds (lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Col. John Sheridan Winn, Jr. (lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Col. Thomas Francis Bresnahan (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Dale Vincent Gaffney (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Curtis Emerson LeMay (captain, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States), Army of the United States, Air Corps.

Col. Emer Yeager, Field Artillery.

Col. Edward Montgomery, Chemical Warfare Service.

Col. Morris Berman (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. William Robert Nichols, Coast Artillery Corps.

Col. Edward Julius Timberlake, Jr. (captain, Air Corps; temporary major, Army of the United States; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States, Air Corps.

Col. Harold Rufus Jackson (lieutenant colonel, Coast Artillery Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Ralph Francis Stearley (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Albert Francis Hegenberger (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Henry Anson Barber, Jr. (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Leo Thomas McMahon (lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Col. George Jacob Nold (lieutenant colonel, Corps of Engineers), Army of the United States.

Col. Charles Edwin Thomas, Jr. (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. John Macaulay Eager, Field Artillery.

Col. David Marshall Ney Ross (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Nathaniel Alanson Burnell 2d (lieutenant colonel, Coast Artillery Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. George Godfrey Lundberg (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Earl Hamlin DeFord (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. David Lewis Ruffner (lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Col. Harold Lyman Clark (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Raymond Whitcomb Bliss, Medical Corps.

Col. Thomas Raphael Phillips (lieutenant colonel, Coast Artillery Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Kenneth Perry McNaughton (major, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Edward Chambers Betts (lieutenant colonel, Judge Advocate General's Department), Army of the United States.

Col. Otto Paul Weyland (major, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Raleigh Raymond Hendrix (major, Coast Artillery Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. William Howard Arnold (major, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Charles Roland Glenn, Medical Corps.

Col. Garrison Holt Davidson (captain, Corps of Engineers), Army of the United States.

Col. William Carroll Christy, Cavalry.

Col. Frank Charles McConnell (major, Coast Artillery Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. John Y. York, Jr. (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. David Myron Schlatter (major, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Ralph Pulsifer (major, Adjutant General's Department), Army of the United States.

Col. Donald Weldon Brann (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Vincent James Meloy (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Mervin Eugene Gross (major, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. George Craig Stewart (major, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Russell Alger Osmun, Quartermaster Corps.

Col. Herbert Slayden Clarkson, Field Artillery.

Col. Roland Francis Walsh, Quartermaster Corps.

Col. Francis Henry Lanahan, Jr. (lieutenant colonel, Signal Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. John Merle Weir (lieutenant colonel, Judge Advocate General's Department), Army of the United States.

Col. Julian Wallace Cunningham (lieutenant colonel, Cavalry), Army of the United States.

Col. James Maurice Gavin (captain, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. James Bryan Newman, Jr. (lieutenant colonel, Corps of Engineers), Army of the United States.

Col. Thomas Harry Ramsey (lieutenant colonel, Quartermaster Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. John Will Coffey (lieutenant colonel, Ordnance Department), Army of the United States.

Col. Paul Hyde Prentiss (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Malcolm Cummings Grow, Medical Corps.

Col. John Trott Murray (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

#### TO BE MAJOR GENERALS

Brig. Gen. Frederick Henry Osborn, United States Army, Reserve.

Brig. Gen. Leonard Fish Wing, National Guard of the United States.

#### POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

#### ALABAMA

Stella E. Martin, Plantersville, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Benjamin L. Edmonds, West Blocton, Ala., in place of B. L. Edmonds. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

#### CALIFORNIA

William R. McKinnon, Livermore, Calif., in place of W. R. McKinnon. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Gertrude S. Adams, Livingston, Calif., in place of V. H. Adams, deceased.

Mayme Lea Jory, Manor, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Meneva S. Latham, Palm City, Calif., in place of E. J. McBride, resigned.

Henry I. Marshall, Ross, Calif., in place of M. R. Braun, resigned.

## COLORADO

Wesley A. Simmer, Blanca, Colo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Victor C. Baker, Fairplay, Colo., in place of F. E. Lilley, resigned.

Roxie R. Broad, Wheat Ridge, Colo., in place of R. R. Broad. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

## CONNECTICUT

Francis H. Whelan, Darien, Conn., in place of P. F. Sherran, removed.

Arthur H. Forst, Seymour, Conn., in place of W. B. Johnson, retired.

Paul F. Cassidy, Woodbury, Conn., in place of W. A. Mansfield, deceased.

## DELAWARE

Alexander P. Gallagher, New Castle, Del., in place of C. J. Dougherty, deceased.

## FLORIDA

Stanley V. Buss, Vero Beach, Fla., in place of J. J. Schumann. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

## GEORGIA

Ola H. Bradbury, Bogart, Ga. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Clarence L. Persons, Eastman, Ga., in place of M. L. Burch, retired.

Frances Catherine Wingate, Ellijay, Ga., in place of W. B. James, retired.

John Marcus Stubbs, Savannah, Ga., in place of Marion Lucas, deceased.

Annie Lee Baker, Shannon, Ga., in place of D. K. Houser, resigned.

Eloise G. Flanders, Swainsboro, Ga., in place of D. E. Flanders, resigned.

## HAWAII

Francis Hughes, Lanikai, Hawaii. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

## IDAHO

Lloyd R. Dyer, Worley, Idaho, in place of C. H. Hoag, retired.

## ILLINOIS

Mary L. Brennan, Elkhart, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Leonard L. Riegel, Galatia, Ill., in place of J. A. Gill. Incumbent's commission expired May 11, 1942.

Emily M. Cole, Glenview, Ill., in place of E. M. Cole. Incumbent's commission expired May 3, 1942.

Anna E. Sullivan, Grand Tower, Ill., in place of A. E. Sullivan. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Paul T. Hartline, Hillsboro, Ill., in place of A. H. Bartlett, resigned.

Lenora B. Dickerson, La Fayette, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Paul F. Lewis, Lawrenceville, Ill., in place of H. C. Johnson, deceased.

Edward J. Shunick, Monmouth, Ill., in place of A. D. Irely, deceased.

Bertha M. Paris, Montgomery, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Mary Convery, Raymond, Ill., in place of Mary Convery. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Otis M. Lamar, Rosiclare, Ill., in place of O. M. Lamar. Incumbent's commission expired May 11, 1942.

Fannie E. Smith, San Jose, Ill., in place of L. M. Cross, resigned.

Walter G. McEwan, Sheldon, Ill., in place of E. M. Snow, resigned.

Ira Dezuouche, Wayne City, Ill., in place of Ira Dezuouche. Incumbent's commission expired April 26, 1942.

## INDIANA

Charles E. Hull, Columbus, Ind., in place of C. A. Thompson, deceased.

Flossie L. Waterstraat, Earl Park, Ind., in place of J. J. Hartman. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Closs D. Samuels, Greensburg, Ind., in place of M. M. Carter, deceased.

Paul E. Byrum, Milltown, Ind., in place of P. E. Byrum. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Ethel Williams, Odon, Ind., in place of John Nichols, deceased.

## IOWA

Gertrude Hunter, Floyd, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Lillian V. White, Manilla, Iowa, in place of F. E. H. Proescholdt, resigned.

Wilbur G. Flam, New London, Iowa, in place of H. E. Chichester, removed.

Ella L. Kloppling, Underwood, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

## KANSAS

Regina Cannon, Beattie, Kans., in place of J. G. O'Neill, transferred.

Clara Sainer, Bison, Kans., in place of Vac-lav Sajner, retired.

Mina Short, Concordia, Kans., in place of W. H. Danenbarger, deceased.

Mary E. Carpenter, Goddard, Kans. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Herbert E. Walter, Kingman, Kans., in place of A. G. Long, resigned.

## KENTUCKY

Charles B. Cox, Benton, Ky., in place of C. B. Cox. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Kenneth T. Marquette, Falmouth, Ky., in place of H. L. Cummins, deceased.

## LOUISIANA

Gussie Long Harris, Athens, La. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Girtherine Evans Lloyd, Grambling, La. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Willie B. Killgore, Lisbon, La. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

## MAINE

Earl L. Garland, Carmel, Maine, in place of E. L. Garland. Incumbent's commission expired February 2, 1941.

Evangeline L. McKenney, Clinton, Maine, in place of A. P. Galusha, transferred.

## MASSACHUSETTS

James H. Monahan, Clifton, Mass., in place of L. H. Thorne, resigned.

Wilma L. Foster, Hamilton, Mass., in place of H. A. Daley, resigned.

Bertha S. Nelson, Raynham, Mass., in place of A. M. Lincoln, resigned.

## MICHIGAN

Ernest R. Brodeur, Cadillac, Mich., in place of Henry Miltner, deceased.

Harry Kramer, Holland, Mich., in place of L. J. Vanderburg, deceased.

Frank W. Wellnau, Ida, Mich., in place of E. J. Weipert, removed.

George J. Carlton, Mackinaw City, Mich., in place of L. M. Wheeler, removed.

Bruce S. Trace, Royal Oak, Mich., in place of G. H. Davis, resigned.

## MINNESOTA

John G. Hawley, Sandstone, Minn., in place of J. F. Hawley, resigned.

Benjamin C. Moe, Wanamingo, Minn., in place of O. W. Hennings, deceased.

## MISSISSIPPI

Eloise G. Stephens, Artesia, Miss. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

John W. Lunday, Jr., Biloxi, Miss., in place of J. R. Meunier, retired.

Alice R. Alexander, Lexington, Miss., in place of M. L. Beall, removed.

Iowa S. Boswell, Sanatorium, Miss., in place of Henry Boswell, removed.

Effie Abernathy, Shannon, Miss., in place of R. E. Gryder, retired.

## MISSOURI

W. Lloyd Wiley, Crane, Mo., in place of B. F. Carney, transferred.

Parks Bacon, El Dorado Springs, Mo., in place of V. D. Washington, deceased.

Lewis A. Newkirk, Everton, Mo., in place of G. T. Barker, retired.

Cecil E. Schwartz, Hannibal, Mo., in place of F. J. Schaul, deceased.

James R. Daily, Schell City, Mo., in place of W. B. Matus, deceased.

Ernest C. Buehler, South St. Joseph, Mo., in place of E. C. Buehler. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Gorda L. Preston, Stockton, Mo., in place of H. E. Church, resigned.

## MONTANA

Allen S. McKenzie, Phillipsburg, Mont., in place of A. S. McKenzie. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

## NEBRASKA

Joyce Hubbard, Ashby, Nebr., in place of Joyce Hubbard. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Claude J. Wright, Aurora, Nebr., in place of C. J. Wright. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Alma E. Rumsey, Bancroft, Nebr., in place of A. E. Rumsey. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Fred C. Buhk, Beemer, Nebr., in place of F. C. Buhk. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Clair Grimes, Chambers, Nebr., in place of Clair Grimes. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Ferdinand S. Bogner, Crofton, Nebr., in place of E. L. Talcott, removed.

Inez G. Britt, Doniphan, Nebr., in place of R. M. Britt, deceased.

C. Arthur Scism, Edgar, Nebr., in place of C. A. Scism. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Helen W. Schneider, Elmwood, Nebr., in place of H. W. Schneider. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Jephtha D. Bishop, Gibbon, Nebr., in place of I. R. L. Taylor, resigned.

Charles Hynek, Humboldt, Nebr., in place of Charles Hynek. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

John J. Burns, Scotia, Nebr., in place of J. J. Burns. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Eric Fredrickson, Wakefield, Nebr., in place of Eric Fredrickson. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Orley E. McCallum, Wauweta, Nebr., in place of O. E. McCallum. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

## NEW HAMPSHIRE

Charles Conrad LaLiberte, Claremont, N. H., in place of W. P. Noll, deceased.

William F. Keating, Hill, N. H., in place of W. F. Keating. Incumbent's commission expired June 18, 1942.

## NEW JERSEY

Francis D. McHugh, Chatham, N. J., in place of L. R. Ress, deceased.

Karl D. Alexander, Cliffside Park, N. J., in place of J. F. O'Toole, deceased.

John A. Wheeler, Monmouth Beach, N. J., in place of J. A. Wheeler. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

William J. Ledger, Stockton, N. J., in place of A. D. Wilson, deceased.

## NEW MEXICO

Robert F. Fisher, Cuba, N. Mex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

## NEW YORK

Frank C. Timm, Attica, N. Y., in place of E. J. Seagert. Incumbent's commission expired June 2, 1942.

Agnes D. Buckley, Boonville, N. Y., in place of F. M. Buckley, deceased.

Mary B. Sherry, East Patchogue, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Alma H. Jones, East Quogue, N. Y., in place of Isabelle Floege, resigned.

Jennie W. Jewell, Fishkill, N. Y., in place of J. W. Jewell. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Agnes Rourke, Gansevoort, N. Y., in place of H. J. Rourke, resigned.

Samuel J. Hand, Genoa, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Joseph P. Wilson, Manhasset, N. Y., in place of R. J. Watrous, removed.

Milton S. Smith, Mayville, N. Y., in place of M. S. Smith. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

S. Erle Dodge, Newfane, N. Y., in place of T. A. Banta, deceased.

Frederick G. Newell, Niagara Falls, N. Y., in place of E. V. Canavan, deceased.

Sylvester J. Krasniewicz, Pine Island, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Wilbur A. Gruhn, Sea Breeze, N. Y., in place of Margaret Van Auker, resigned.

Josephine Westphall, South New Berlin, N. Y., in place of H. E. Morrell, resigned.

Walter Rossen, Vestal, N. Y., in place of H. E. Dean, resigned.

Parke Higgins, Warsaw, N. Y., in place of F. J. Taylor, resigned.

J. Austin Howe, Weedsport, N. Y., in place of E. D. Guyder. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Myrtle M. Freeman, Windsor, N. Y., in place of Ward Kilpatrick, deceased.

#### NORTH CAROLINA

Edgar M. Martin, East Bend, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

James C. Swain, Plymouth, N. C., in place of G. W. Hardison, deceased.

Gertrude B. Speir, Winterville, N. C., in place of N. R. Hunsucker, transferred.

#### NORTH DAKOTA

Edwin H. Naumann, Kramer, N. Dak., in place of T. J. Naumann, resigned.

Curtis L. Wright, Michigan, N. Dak., in place of Anthony Hentges, retired.

Nick F. Schammel, Tolley, N. Dak., in place of C. E. Mulinex, retired.

#### OKLAHOMA

Maude A. Cumming, Adair, Okla., in place of J. W. Wright, transferred.

James E. Terrell, Elmore City, Okla., in place of J. E. Terrell. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1941.

#### PENNSYLVANIA

Florence M. Armstrong, Allenwood, Pa., in place of Richard Armstrong, deceased.

George F. Purpur, Danville, Pa., in place of H. C. VanKirk, deceased.

Armena Blumette, Harnarville, Pa., in place of Michael Mroff, resigned.

Willard K. Allison, Hickory, Pa., in place of W. K. Allison. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Alice M. Prascsak, Indianola, Pa., in place of V. M. Burrell, resigned.

Chester M. Fies, Laureldale, Pa., in place of E. S. Warmkessel, resigned.

Mary B. Marr, Norristown, Pa., in place of B. J. O'Rourke, deceased.

Ethel C. Ufema, Slickville, Pa., in place of J. E. Franklin, resigned.

#### RHODE ISLAND

Elton L. Clark, North Scituate, R. I., in place of E. L. Clark. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

#### SOUTH CAROLINA

Ray E. Young, Due West, S. C., in place of R. E. Young. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Andrew M. Blair, Rion, S. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

William F. Griffin, Travellers Rest, S. C., in place of J. H. Coleman, transferred.

#### TENNESSEE

Sadie P. Omohundro, Donelson, Tenn., in place of J. F. Moore, removed.

Thomas D. Walker, Kerrville, Tenn., in place of T. D. Walker. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Henry G. Simpson, Middleton, Tenn., in place of Maurice Wilson, retired.

#### TEXAS

Otto M. Naegelin, Castroville, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Rosa A. Haynes, Eden, Tex., in place of Edna Williams, transferred.

Anna Jo Wilson, Gunter, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Leonard B. Baldwin, Huntsville, Tex., in place of L. B. Baldwin. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Russell B. Cope, Lorraine, Tex., in place of R. B. Cope. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Hattie M. Welch, Meadow, Tex., in place of A. C. Finley, transferred.

Clarence M. Maney, Natalia, Tex., in place of C. G. White, deceased.

Mary Elizabeth Graves, Port Isabel, Tex., in place of R. S. Wait, resigned.

Paulin J. Fowler, South San Antonio, Tex., in place of P. J. Fowler. Incumbent's commission expired April 6, 1942.

Charles M. Palmer, Vickery, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

#### VERMONT

Mary A. Weleher, Bethel, Vt., in place of M. A. Keleher. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Earle J. Rogers, Cabot, Vt., in place of E. J. Rogers. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Gertrude L. Cutler, Cambridge, Vt., in place of G. L. Cutler. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Hollis S. Johnson, Castleton, Vt., in place of H. S. Johnson. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Rutherford D. Pfennig, Forest Dale, Vt., in place of R. D. Pfennig. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Harriette R. Wilson, Greensboro, Vt., in place of N. L. Heidger, resigned.

William T. Johnson, Hardwick, Vt., in place of W. T. Johnson. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Frank J. Donahue, Middlebury, Vt., in place of F. J. Donahue. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Mabel R. Turner, Rupert, Vt., in place of M. R. Turner. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Ruth A. Randall, Wells River, Vt., in place of R. A. Randall. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Ruby C. Gauthier, Wilder, Vt. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Margaret M. Flower, Woodstock, Vt., in place of M. M. Flower. Incumbent's commission expired April 20, 1942.

#### VIRGINIA

Carrie F. Patterson, Greenwood, Va., in place of C. F. Patterson. Incumbent's commission expired February 2, 1942.

Lexie M. VanDyke, Jewell Ridge, Va., in place of B. P. Nearhood, resigned.

Harris Hill Gee, Meherrin, Va., in place of M. E. Gee, deceased.

#### WASHINGTON

Jehu O. Patterson, Pullman, Wash., in place of J. O. Patterson. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

John O. Mills, Woodland, Wash., in place of R. H. Mitchell, resigned.

#### WEST VIRGINIA

John B. Puryear, Jr., Holden, W. Va., in place of J. B. Puryear, Jr. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Martha J. Snyder, Shepherdstown, W. Va., in place of W. B. Snyder, deceased.

#### WISCONSIN

Arthur H. Klingbeil, Brodhead, Wis., in place of A. N. Lawton, resigned.

Harold C. Krentz, Westfield, Wis., in place of Samuel Dewar, retired.

#### WYOMING

Carl W. Hornbeck, Shoshoni, Wyo., in place of L. M. Blackwell, retired.

#### CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate September 28 (legislative day of September 15), 1943:

##### UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Guy T. Helvering, to be United States district judge for the district of Kansas.

##### COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS

Joseph A. Ziembra to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 39, with headquarters at Chicago, Ill.

Martin R. Bradley to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 38, with headquarters at Detroit, Mich.

Bernice Pyke to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 41, with headquarters at Cleveland, Ohio.

##### FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES

##### PROMOTIONS

##### Consul generals

Maurice L. Stafford  
Henry M. Wolcott

##### Consuls

Walter W. Hoffmann  
Reginald P. Mitchell  
Rollin R. Winslow

##### Foreign Service officers of class 1

Maynard B. Barnes	Joseph F. McGurk
William P. Blocker	Edward L. Reed
Richard P. Butrick	H. Earle Russell
Felix Cole	Rudolf E. Schoenfeld
Frederick P. Hibbard	Harold H. Tittmann
Robert F. Kelley	Orme Wilson

##### Foreign Service officers of class 2

Ellis O. Briggs	Sydney B. Redecker
Parker W. Buhrman	Laurence B. Salisbury
Herbert S. Bursley	Harold Shantz
William E. De Courcy	Ashley B. Sowell
Dudley G. Dwyre	Edwin F. Stanton
Walter A. Foote	Christian T. Steger
Waldemar J. Gallman	Howard K. Travers
George D. Hopper	Fletcher Warren
Charles A. Livengood	

##### Foreign Service officers of class 3

Wainwright Abbott	Thomas McEnelly
Charles A. Bay	John R. Minter
Hiram A. Boucher	John J. Muccio
Clarence C. Brooks	Earl L. Packer
George H. Butler	Austin R. Preston
Harry E. Carlson	Benjamin Reath
Owen L. Dawson	Riggs
Samuel H. Day	Joseph C. Satter-
Hooker A. Doolittle	thwaite
Fayette J. Flexer	James T. Scott
Raleigh A. Gibson	Samuel Sokobin
Julian F. Harrington	George Tait
Frank Anderson	Marshall M. Vance
Henry	Jesse F. Van Wickel
Karl deG. MacVitty	

##### Foreign Service officers of class 4

Charles E. Bohlen	John J. Melly
Russell M. Brooks	Harold M. Randall
John H. Bruins	James W. Riddle-
John M. Cabot	berger
A. Bland Calder	William W. Schott
Leo J. Callanan	Edward J. Sparks
Archib W. Childs	Maurice L. Stafford
Walton C. Ferris	Alan N. Steyne
George Gregg Fuller	Harry L. Troutman
W. Perry George	Frederik van den
Franklin C. Gowen	Arend
Robert Y. Jarvis	James R. Wilkinson
Edward B. Lawson	Miss Frances E. Wil-
Edward F. Lawton	lis

*Foreign Service officers of class 5*

Ware Adams	Charles H. Heisler
Burton Y. Berry	Hervé J. L'Heureux
Lee R. Blohm	John H. Madonna
James C. H. Bonbright	Erik W. Magnuson
Daniel M. Braddock	Horatio Mooers
James E. Brown, Jr.	James K. Penfield
Homer M. Byington, Jr.	Edwin Schoenrich
Everett F. Drumright	Horace H. Smith
Elbridge Durbrow	Llewellyn E. Thompson, Jr.
Peter H. A. Flood	Edward T. Wailes
Richard B. Haven	Carlos J. Warner
	Thomas C. Wasson

*Foreign Service officers of class 8*

Theodore C. Achilles	Edward Page, Jr.
Garret G. Ackerson, Jr.	George W. Renchard
Roy E. B. Bower	Henry E. Stebbins
Montgomery H. Coladay	Francis Bowden Stevens
John Davies, Jr.	Laurence W. Taylor
William S. Farrell	Robert F. Woodward
Heyward G. Hill	James H. Wright
J. Winsor Ives	Lloyd D. Yates
Robert G. McGregor, Jr.	

*Foreign Service officers of class 7*

Hector C. Adam, Jr.	Donal F. McGonigal
William K. Allshie	J. Graham Parsons
E. Tomlin Bailey	Marselis C. Parsons, Jr.
Russell W. Benton	John C. Pool
Roswell C. Beverstock	George F. Scherer
Glen W. Bruner	William P. Snow
Richard W. Byrd	Carl W. Strom
Gilbon Curtis, Jr.	Earle C. Taylor
Andrew B. Foster	T. Elliot Well
Owen W. Gaines	Ivan B. White
Norris S. Hasetton	Arthur R. Williams
Douglas MacArthur 2d	Elbert G. Mathews

*Foreign Service officers of class 8*

William Belton	Robert Grinnell
Lampton Berry	Theodore J. Hadraba
William O. Boswell	Robert F. Hale
Charles R. Burrows	Parker T. Hart
Robert T. Cowan	Franklin Hawley
Leon L. Cowles	Martin J. Hillenbrand
H. Francis Cunningham, Jr.	John Everts Horner
Philip M. Davenport	Outerbridge Horsey
Richard H. Davis	Hungerford B. Howard
Arthur B. Emmons 3d	William L. Krieg
Vernon L. Fluharty	Carl F. Norden
Fulton Freeman	R. Kenneth Oakley
A. David Fritzman	Robert W. Rinden
Ralph C. Getsinger	George Lybrook West, Jr.
John Goodyear	Randolph A. Kidder

## IN THE NAVY

## JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL

Rear Admiral Thomas L. Gatch to be Judge Advocate General of the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral, for a term of 4 years.

## APPOINTMENTS FOR TEMPORARY SERVICE IN THE NAVY

## Rear admiral

Roscoe E. Schuirmann to be rear admiral in the Navy for temporary service to rank from May 16, 1942

To be commodores in the Navy, for temporary service

Edward J. Moran	Edward J. Foy
Henry S. Kendall	Frederick G. Reinicke
Giles E. Short	William A. Sullivan
Leslie E. Gehres	Andrew F. Carter
Thomas S. Combs	

## IN THE MARINE CORPS

## TEMPORARY SERVICE

Brig. Gen. William H. Rupertus to be major general in the Marine Corps for temporary service from September 28, 1942.

Col. Lemuel C. Shepherd to be brigadier general in the Marine Corps for temporary service from September 16, 1942.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 28, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who are the Lord of life, like the wise one of old, we pray for wisdom that we may not go astray in the wilderness of selfish ambitions. Out of the gates of Thy throne flow the streams that sweeten the bitter waters of human experience; help us to acquire pure hearts and contented minds. When weariness of heart threatens, strengthen us; when petty vexations distract, refresh us with the benediction of Thy grace.

Almighty God, we would repeat it over and over again that it is the unseen life which is real and eternal, that which is seen is temporal. O consider our hopes, our yearning spirits, our unspoken prayers and our quivering faith which so often in silence and loneliness look up to Thee, too sacred for speech. Be not blind to the virtues and graces which live in many a human breast, not set on selfish ends. As Thou dost look down upon the martyrdom of man, bearing the whips and scorns in pain and in sorrow, O let the burning truth steady all souls that brutal force and power cannot survive. They that mourn are blessed and Thy comfort and triumph are reserved for them; the peacemakers shall yet see the children of God destined to inherit the earth. In the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

## MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

## REPRESENTATIVE-ELECT ERRETT P. SCRIVNER

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House a communication from the Clerk of the House.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEPTEMBER 28, 1943.

The honorable the SPEAKER,  
House of Representatives.

SIR: The certificate of election in due form of law of Hon. ERRETT P. SCRIVNER as Representative-elect to the Seventy-eighth Congress from the Second Congressional District of Kansas, to fill a vacancy in that district, is on file in this office.

Very truly yours,

SOUTH TRIMBLE,

Clerk of the House of Representatives.

## SWEARING IN OF A MEMBER

Representative-elect ERRETT P. SCRIVNER appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

## ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Thursday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?  
There was no objection.

## LIVING COSTS IN ST. LOUIS, MO.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of myself and my colleagues the gentlemen from Missouri [Mr. PROESER and Mr. MILLER], who, like myself, represent part of the city of St. Louis, I present to the House for reference to the proper committee petitions signed by the citizens of our city, containing 54,607 names, urging a reduction in the cost of living.

These petitions are addressed to the Congress of the United States asking for a roll-back of prices to September 15, 1942, as outlined in the following measures:

First. Subsidies on a differential basis to cover the special burdens of small business and high-cost producers.

Second. Grade labeling.

Third. Dollars-and-cents ceilings on all cost-of-living items at their September 15, 1942, level.

Fourth. Continued rent control.

Fifth. A strong Office of Price Administration—staffed with loyal supporters of price control, given adequate funds for enforcement, with full power to enforce ceilings and to compel delivery of supplies by the food processors.

An organization which is known as the United Labor Committee of Greater St. Louis, representing the A. F. of L., the C. I. O., the railroad brotherhoods, and other unions in cooperating with other citizens and organizations, circulated the petitions and secured the signatures. By no means are all the signers of the petitions members of labor organizations. Thousands of the signers are housewives. Volunteer workers set up booths in the neighborhood shopping areas calling those who passed to the attention of the petitions, the purpose of preparing them, and urging signatures provided the citizen was in favor of the effort. It fairly represents the opinion of the citizens of St. Louis, especially those whose earnings place them in what we commonly call the lower brackets.

It is admitted that there has been some increase in wages but for a long time few increases have been made while the cost of living has steadily increased. I am not talking now about luxuries but the necessities of life—food, clothing, medicine, and so forth. I feel confident if the cost of living could be put back to September 15, 1942, there would be practically no demands for increase in wages, but when the wage earner finds that his weekly earnings are not sufficient to properly care for his family, naturally there is dissension. We do not want black markets nor do we want the people of this country bidding for such commodities as are available.

I have never been enthusiastic about subsidies, but if subsidies are necessary in order to maintain the standard of living to which our citizens are accustomed, then serious consideration should be given to the efforts of those administering the various laws who advocate subsidies.

The Office of Price Administration has been giving attention to a program for rolling the cost of living back nearly 5 percent, or to that which prevailed Sep-

tember 15, 1942. Recently the general manager of the Office of Price Administration announced a three-way program. It is to be hoped that those administering the laws can grant the relief desired by these petitions, but in the event that they cannot, then I urge that Congress give serious consideration to the entire question.

The officers of the United Labor Committee that forwarded these petitions are Joseph P. Clark, president; William Sentner, first vice president; William Anderson, treasurer; Oscar A. Ehrhardt, secretary.

Executive board: Victor Boggs, Richard Brazier, John J. Church, Ben Gilbert, Lloyd McBride, Harry Mertz, James Pfaffenbach, Louis Renschen, John I. Rollings, Lloyd Weber.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, these petitions which have been prepared by the United Labor Committee of St. Louis, constitute an expression of many thousands of St. Louisans who are alarmed by the failure of O. P. A. to control the increases in the cost of living. The objective of these petitions is to hold prices down, to prevent any further inflationary price rises. That is a worthy and most necessary objective.

We all do not agree on the practical steps which may be used to correct a situation which has already been allowed to get out of bounds. I do not agree that all of the steps advocated in these petitions are either sound economically or workable, but I think we can all agree that the Price Control Act, as amended by the Congress in 1942, did give sufficient power to the Office of Price Administration to accomplish worthwhile results. It is regrettable that administration of that law has been such as to cause failure in many price fields.

Congress should continue diligent efforts toward the objective expressed in these petitions.

#### REDUCING THE COST OF LIVING

Mr. MILLER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join with my colleagues from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN and Mr. PLOESER], in presenting to the House for reference to the appropriate committee the petitions bearing the signatures of 54,607 citizens of St. Louis urging the Congress to aid in reducing the cost of living.

The United Labor Committee of Greater St. Louis, comprising representatives of the A. F. of L., the C. I. O., and the railroad brotherhoods, have rendered a splendid public service in circulating and securing the signatures to these petitions. In this effort they have succeeded in bringing more forcibly to the attention of the citizens of St. Louis the grave situation not only confronting them but the people of the Nation in the matter of the cost of living.

The rising spiral of prices, with the attendant threat of inflation, has been felt in every home. The time has come,

not only to put an end if possible to any further rise in the prices of the necessities of life, but especially foods, but to turn these prices back to the levels of September 15, 1942.

Congress has increased the borrowing power of the Commodity Credit Corporation by \$350,000,000 in an effort to hold the line and turn back the prices of certain foodstuffs. In my judgment it would have been best had the price on all necessities been frozen the day war was declared—this the Congress was not asked to do—and those in charge of our Government at Washington failed to do.

I cannot conscientiously subscribe to the belief that subsidies are the proper means to stabilize and roll back prices. If I thought this would do the job, I would back such a proposal to the limit. On the contrary, subsidies will only aggravate what is already a bad situation, due to the bungling and incompetence of the policies and personnel of the O. P. A. Everyone is agreed that prices must be kept down and where out of line turned back to reasonable levels. Subsidies will not prevent inflation—they will contribute to it by giving more people more money with which to bid in the black market for the things that they want and need. A hungry man with hungry children at home will not debate the price of meat or bread, nor where or how, or how much he will pay for it. He will demand and obtain these things at the risk of his own life.

We must remember that the consumer is also a taxpayer who has an added interest in food subsidies. He and his descendants must repay not only the principal but the interest and administration cost of subsidies. And what does this mean in terms of dollars and cents? It is estimated upon good authority that a total subsidy program upon foods would cost no less than \$450,000,000, with an additional \$50,000,000 for administration—making a total of \$500,000,000. To pay this subsidy the Government must sell bonds maturing in, say, 50 years, bearing interest at the rate of 2.9 percent. The interest on these bonds alone would amount to \$725,000,000, and this added to the subsidy of \$500,000,000 would mean that it would cost the taxpayers a minimum of \$1,225,000,000, which, in simpler terms, means that each individual who saves \$3.92 on his 1943 grocery bill would be obliged to pay back in interest and cost of administration \$9.15.

What right have we to saddle upon the returned soldier, who now receives \$50 per month and risks his life for us, an unpaid portion of today's grocery bill while some of those at home earn \$400 and \$500 per month? It is as my distinguished colleague from South Dakota, Congressman MUNDT, observed, like putting a tax on the chauffeur's beer to help buy champagne for the owner of the automobile. Shall today's food be paid in cash by me or partly in I O U's tomorrow by the soldier who is fighting to make my job and our form of government secure?

Our present problem is one not so much of price as it is of production. It is one of scarcity and not of surplus.

The demands of the armed forces and those of our allies have created a scarcity of those commodities which are essential to our existence, and which we have become accustomed to believe were always abundant.

The answer to this important question does not lie in sugar-coated subsidies but in production and more production of the very things that we seek to subsidize. The days of planned scarcities as advocated and practiced by the New Deal are at an end. The answer now and hereafter should be to develop and practice a philosophy of plenty.

It would not be proper to condemn subsidies and expose the fallacies of such a program without being able to offer a plan to solve the difficulties of the present situation. It is my firm belief that we need a program which will encourage rather than discourage maximum production of food and fair distribution at equitable prices. I propose: First, effective coordination through a single head of our Government activities affecting food production, distribution, and price control. Second, a manpower program for the farmers which will enable them to produce the maximum of foodstuffs and feed. Third, provision for adequate supplies of farm machinery and the necessary fuel for carrying out such a program. Fourth, simplification of the operation of price controls with greater utilization of the experience of those engaged in producing and marketing food and farm products.

It seems to me that adequate provision has been made to enable O. P. A. to effectively test its control over the price of certain foodstuffs during the coming year. Should O. P. A. continue to bungle, and should the program of price controls flounder and fall in a maze of mistakes, then it is imperative that we proceed at once to remove the cause of the present deplorable condition; that is, lack of production of essential foodstuffs.

I am delighted to unite my efforts with those of my colleagues from Missouri in bringing these petitions to the attention of the Congress with the fervent hope and sincere prayer that a solution may be found of the difficulties which they depict. The Congress is truly the voice of the people and to it should they always be able to come and find redress.

#### THE MILK SITUATION IN NORTHERN OHIO

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, I am in receipt of a letter this morning from one of my constituents, and I think it might be well to read it to the House. That letter is as follows:

Mr. Rowe: If the Government wishes to help the dairymen of northern Ohio, something should be done quickly. I realize that you belong to the minority party and cannot get much attention from the O. P. A.

Yours,

KARL H. SWAN.

P. S.—You need not take your valuable time to acknowledge this squawk.

Enclosed with the letter is the following advertisement:

NOTICE!

With much regret, on Saturday, September 11, we will discontinue our retail delivery of milk.

Due to O. P. A. ceiling on milk prices, scarcity of feed, and labor conditions, it becomes necessary we make this decision.

We wish to thank all our customers for their patronage and hope that some day we will be back to serve you again.

Sincerely,

HARLAN DALE FARMS.

At a later date, 103 head of registered Holsteins and Jersey cattle will be offered for private sale.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the subject of shipbuilding and merchant seamen, and include a statement by Rear Admiral Emory S. Land; also a release from the War Shipping Administration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a speech by my colleague [Mr. PLOESER].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a proclamation by the President designating the week of October 3 as Fire Prevention Week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next after special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

MISSOURI RIVER FLOOD CONTROL

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, flood damage on the Missouri River can be ended for all time. I do not say that as my own opinion; I say it as the result of reading a report approved by the United States Army engineers. Last Saturday afternoon I went to the office of the Chief of Engineers and read the report of the division engineer made in response to a resolution by the Flood Control Committee of the House of Representatives. The report was prepared by Col. Lewis A. Pick, who has just left the division for an overseas assignment. It has been approved by the Board of Engineers and is now under review by the Federal Power Commission and the Bureau of Reclamation.

The report is not released, as yet, and of course, will not be until transmitted to the Congress, but Members can read it and can draw conclusions or make observations on it as I am now doing. For the benefit of those who have not yet had an opportunity to read it, let me say this:

The report and recommendations follow the analysis of Missouri River flood problems made by Colonel Pick in the series of addresses he gave at meetings arranged this summer by Gov. M. Q. Sharpe, chairman of the Eight-State Committee. Downstream below Sioux City, where the flood plain is wide, the report calls for levees on the main stem of the river and dams on the tributaries. Above Sioux City, where the bluffs are closer together and reservoir sites abound, the report recommends multiple-purpose storage reservoirs in sufficient number to impound and put under control the entire flow of the river for the largest flood on record.

The cost of this program is less than 10 times the popular estimate of direct and indirect damages of last year's floods. In other words, 10 floods like those of 1943 would cost as much as what both the division engineer and the Board of Engineers describe as complete protection for the flood plain below Sioux City for all floods of past magnitude.

I trust that all Members interested will do what they can to expedite transmission of the report to Congress and action on it here.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a poem.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix on two subjects and to include in one a resolution passed by the Oil Workers' Convention and in the other an editorial from the Pacific Rural Press.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of today's business and any other special orders that may be on the calendar, I may be granted permission to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's table and any other special orders heretofore entered, I be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

CLARA CITY, MINN., LEADS NATION IN WAR BOND DRIVE

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, Clara City, Minn., is a village containing only 844 people. Today it stands out as the No. 1 community in the Nation in the Third War Loan drive. This

small village with a loan goal of \$43,000 went over the top even before the drive was officially opened.

In recognition of Clara City's accomplishment a captured Japanese submarine was rerouted in its tour of Minnesota, and as a consequence over \$14,000 additional in bonds were sold in a 3-hour period in this patriotic community.

The following article from the Minneapolis Sunday Tribune of September 19, 1943, illustrates what a small village can do in a war loan drive, and I personally am proud of having in my congressional district, the seventh of Minnesota, the Nation's No. 1 leader in this respect:

DOUBLE QUOTA LOOMS AS SALES BOOM

(By Willmar Thorkelson)

CLARA CITY, MINN.—Salute the No. 1 community on the Nation's bondwagon.

It's this alert Minnesota village of 844 persons.

Beating to the punch the rest of the State and Nation, Clara City hustled to its Third War Loan goal of \$43,000 even before the drive officially opened.

And today this town's citizens had good reason to believe they would double their own quota for cash-in-the-bank War bond sales at close of business Saturday totaled \$74,384.73.

This is 173 percent of their quota.

Going over the top ahead of the Third War Loan's start is a tribute to the energy and organization of local War bond officials, who decided as long ago as last April this village would be first in this drive.

The feat was accomplished, too, because almost 100 percent of the families bought bonds.

These people, more than 80 percent of them of German descent, attained their goal largely in small denomination E series bonds.

Only 16 of the bonds bought were \$1,000 or larger, and the biggest individual purchase was \$4,000, made by Dr. H. T. Foshager, the town's physician.

In recognition of Clara City's accomplishment, the captured Jap submarine was rerouted in its tour of Minnesota and was brought here Thursday. No other community so small has been visited by the sub.

Appearance here of the enemy vessel of destruction resulted in the sale of \$14,193.75 in bonds in 3 hours Thursday morning.

In addition, youngsters at the village's public and parochial schools bought \$112 in War stamps as their admission.

About 1,200 persons, including scores of farmers from this center's rich trade area, viewed the sub during its half-hour stay.

Yeoman Eddie Gallaher, of Navy Public Relations, Minneapolis, traveling with the sub in Minnesota, congratulated Clara City on behalf of Secretary of the Treasury Morgenthau.

The village's 68-year-old mayor, John Barney, Sr., who came from Germany 50 years ago, reminded the audience how fortunate they were to be "living in the good old U. S. A."

He urged his citizens to buy even more War bonds, "so when the war is over and our boys come back, we can look into their eyes, shake their hands, tell them they won the war for us and that we at home tried our best to help them win it."

Backing up the 134 men in service from Clara City and vicinity was one of the indirect objectives of the campaign.

Fred Frekker, State highway employee and a regular bond buyer, said he didn't know a better way to support his only three sons, Donald, Willard, and Leslie, all in the service, than by buying bonds. "I don't know of a better investment, either," he declared.

Village War-bond chairman is E. G. Weflen, manager of Farmers Cooperative Elevator Association, who is a World War veteran and has a son, Arnold, who is a marine lieutenant.

Weflen credits success of the drive to the splendid cooperation solicitors received from the village's citizens and to the excellent help of the town's two banks and Postmaster Laurence Voight.

Dr. R. A. Merrill, veterinarian and member of the Chippewa County war finance committee, insists Clara City made its record because it is "the garden spot of western Minnesota and can produce the 'kale' needed to buy War bonds. Besides, this community is noted for its frugality."

Emil A. Swanson, editor of the Clara City Herald, suggests the reason is that the town is "the home of good organization," which happens to be its motto.

During the Second War Loan drive last April, the village had a goal of \$23,000, which it exceeded the first day. It ended that campaign with \$41,995 in sales.

That response encouraged Weflen and Gordon A. Yock, merchant and area war-bond chairman, to try to reach Clara City's September quota even before the drive started.

They wired early for pledge cards which were distributed at a solicitors' meeting September 1. The 29 solicitors each were assigned a list of prospects and by the evening of September 7 sufficient pledges had been redeemed in cash bond purchases to exceed the quota. This was 36 hours before the drive was launched in Minnesota.

In organizing the campaign, Weflen and Yock worked closely with W. D. Grashuis, president of Citizens State Bank of Clara City, and B. A. Behrends, cashier of Clara City State Bank.

Besides these four men, others responsible for Clara City's war-bond successes as solicitors included: John Andresen, William Andresen, Henry Koester, E. J. Thein, Peter DeGrote, John Caspers, F. P. Schulte, C. H. Stefens, Dr. R. A. Merrill, August Mohr, John Thein, Emil Swanson, J. B. Stager, Adrian Haen, George Tammen, Elso Davids, A. L. Thissen, W. E. Lynam, Dr. H. T. Poshager, Louis Tammen, A. E. Prekker, Sr., Mrs. Daniel Jaenisch, Charles Wulling, and George Thein.

#### COMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MANSFIELD] has asked me to request that the Committee on Rivers and Harbors be permitted to sit during the session of the House this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MAUK] be permitted to extend his own remarks under the title "Army and Navy Electronics Production Agency."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HEIDINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter I recently received from the Danciger Oil Refining Company of Fort Worth, Tex.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an article by Walter Lippmann.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

#### SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON GASOLINE RATIONING AND OIL PRODUCTION

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I take the time of the House to announce that the Special Committee on Gasoline Rationing and Oil Production, of which I have the honor to be chairman, will meet tomorrow, Wednesday morning, in the caucus room in the Old House Office Building at 11 o'clock. Members of the executive committee from each State are especially urged to be present, and, of course, all other Members of the House, both from the Midwest and from the East, will be very welcome.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. Lecompte. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a set of resolutions of the Commercial Club of Albia, Iowa.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

#### CONGRATULATIONS, LEO CROWLEY

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Speaker, recently the President announced two changes in his official family—the appointment of Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., and Leo T. Crowley to new positions of trust and responsibility. Both appointments have been received with generous and favorable comment by the Washington newspapers.

I do not know Mr. Stettinius but judging from his past record and the favorable comments made by those who do know him, it would indicate that the President made an excellent choice.

Mr. Crowley comes from my home city at Madison, Wis., and has been a personal friend since childhood. It is, therefore, with extreme gratification and pleasure that I read of Leo's elevation to increased responsibility and trust on the part of the President of the United States during its most trying period since the Civil War. Mr. Crowley's increased responsibilities are the result of the efficient and satisfactory manner in which he has discharged other duties entrusted to him by the President.

He came to Washington from Madison, Wis., as Chairman of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, which office he has filled with exceptional skill and the least possible amount of friction. So well was the President satisfied with Mr. Crowley's conduct of this agency that he placed additional burdens upon him.

The next post of trust was the Office of Custodian of Alien Property. This Office meant the taking over of hundreds of millions of dollars worth of property

and thousands of patent rights. It also meant that President Roosevelt did not want any of the scandals arising in the administration of these properties which grew out of the custodianship of alien property in the last World War. That Office has evidently been administered with the usual skill with which Mr. Crowley has administered the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

Next came the difficult task of taking over the functions of the foreign economic activities that had been the subject of a controversy between Vice President WALLACE and Secretary of Commerce Jones. This was a difficult task to undertake because of prominence given by the newspapers in regard to this controversy, and the fact that newspapers and magazines were taking sides on the questions involved. In the face of these facts, Mr. Crowley presided with his usual unassuming tact and diplomacy to iron out the difficulties and get this office functioning in a proper manner. Undoubtedly a satisfactory result was achieved because the President would not have again entrusted him with additional burdens and responsibility unless he had been certain that a satisfactory job was being done by Mr. Crowley.

Now comes the latest burden and responsibility placed upon Mr. Crowley's shoulders—that of administering the billions of dollars passed out to the United Nations under lend lease and also the relief program originally placed in the hands of New York's former Governor Lehman.

To the thousands of friends of Leo Crowley back home, there is genuine pleasure in the honors heaped upon him, and there is every confidence that these offices of trust will be ably and efficiently administered, and there is one thing of which all of us will be absolutely certain: there will be no scandals growing out of any of these functions because Leo Crowley is scrupulously honest and will not tolerate the suspicion of dishonesty on the part of any of his subordinates.

Many who come to Washington and achieve high honors become afflicted with the disease known as "Washingtonitis." In the case of Leo Crowley, there is not the slightest change in his manner or attitude toward the thousands of people whom he has always known. On the streets of Madison, in the barber shops and wherever men gather, he is still just Leo to everyone. The thousands of his friends in all walks of life, including the old, the young, the rich and the poor, men, women, and children, all rejoice that he has been elevated to a high place, and all of them have every confidence that the trust reposed in him will be faithfully carried out.

Kind and generous to everyone, his sympathetic and gentle nature breeds affection and loyalty in the hearts of those with whom he is associated.

Congratulations, Leo; and the best of luck.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

#### GEN. JOHN L. DEWITT

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks to include a resolution adopted by the San Francisco Down Town Association with reference to Lt. Gen. John L. DeWitt and the distinguished service he has rendered both to the Pacific coast and the Nation in his administration of the Japanese question and all other military matters which have been under his jurisdiction as commander of the Fourth Army and western defense.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, in all Pacific coast history there has never been a more capable military officer assigned to duty on the Pacific coast. He has won the support, good will, and hearty approval of every civic, labor, church, and fraternal organization by the superb manner in which he has handled every problem of military significance affecting our civilian population and national security. His very presence and demeanor have helped build civilian morale and gave a deep sense of security to every man, woman, and child during the days immediately following the cowardly Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor. As a tribute to this outstanding man I present the following resolution recently adopted by the Down Town Association:

#### D'WITT COMMENDED FOR CONTROL OF JAPANESE

The following resolution was adopted by the board of directors of the Down Town Association today, Wednesday, September 15, 1943:

Whereas since the black-out nights and the anxious days following Pearl Harbor, Lt. Gen. John L. DeWitt has rendered distinguished service as commander of the Fourth Army and western defense, and California has felt secure under the protection of his wise leadership and the policies he has adopted and enforced; and

Whereas that sense of security has rested in large part upon his understanding, courage, and vigor in promptly excluding all persons of the Japanese race, whether native or foreign-born, from the Pacific coast area; and

Whereas Gen. John L. DeWitt has been assigned to higher command at the Army and Navy Staff College at Washington, and Lt. Gen. Delos C. Emmons succeeds to the heavy responsibility of commander of the Fourth Army; and

Whereas the Down Town Association of San Francisco has heretofore gone on record and directed a communication to the Secretary of War opposing, in the interest of public security, the return of any persons of Japanese ancestry to the Pacific coast area during the war period: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Down Town Association of San Francisco hereby expresses to General DeWitt its sincere appreciation and compliments for the outstanding service which he has rendered to his country and especially to California and the entire Pacific coast area, in the performance of his duties as commander of our armed forces charged with the protection of the exposed western borders of our country; and be it further

Resolved, That to his successor, Gen. Delos C. Emmons, we convey a welcome and the expression of our confidence that his past distinguished services can be accepted as an assurance that the security which we have felt under his predecessor will be continued under his command and that the wise policy

of excluding Japanese from the Pacific coast area will be maintained throughout the war.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

#### LABOR LAWS—AND LOGIC

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record and to include therein an editorial that appeared in the September 11, 1943, issue of Business Week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks of today in the Appendix of the Record and include an editorial which appeared in the September 11, 1943, issue of Business Week, published by the McGraw-Hill Publishing Co., I would like to make this observation.

This publication, as everyone knows, speaks the mind of business. It appears from this editorial that since business has had a chance to see the results of the Connally-Smith Act, it realizes it was bad legislation.

When the Connally-Smith war labor disputes bill—the so-called antistrike bill—was before the Congress, we were informed by various means, and from numerous sources, that organized labor opposed the bill.

In view of the fact that business is now opposed to the Connally-Smith Act, as well as labor, and it is universally recognized it is a bad law, there should be no hesitancy on the part of Congress to correct this innocuous situation by repealing the Connally-Smith Act at once. I sincerely hope every Member of Congress will read every word of this editorial very carefully.

#### UNADJUSTED VETERANS' CLAIMS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include therein certain figures from the Veterans' Administration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, there is a matter that has been troubling me for some time and I am sure that it is also troubling the Members of the House, and that is the backlog of unadjudicated cases of World War No. 2 veterans pending in the Veterans' Administration offices. In Boston alone the unadjudicated cases are increasing at the rate of 600 a month approximately.

In the Boston office, on September 22, of this year, there were pending 4,300 cases unadjudicated of World War No. 2. On September 1, 3,900 cases were un-

adjudicated. It is an inexcusable situation. The officials should have thought of this problem in time to provide sufficient personnel and if they did not have them within their own department they should have asked for such personnel in departments where their work is not so necessary. The matter was brought to the Veterans' Administration's attention on numerous occasions, but no action was taken, although the Administration had all information needed from the War Department regarding cases.

The Veterans' Administration advises me they have asked to have additional rating boards and additional personnel to go to the district and regional offices. I am not at all convinced that they will send enough. Requests were made some time ago for personnel with no results. I know that every Member will join with me in seeing that that is done because the least we can do is to see that these returning men who are disabled receive proper care and the compensation to which they are entitled. The matter of hospitalization facilities is one that I have been working on. They are inadequate. Most of these cases are men who have been discharged from the service because of service disability. It is of little use to pass legislation for the veterans if the laws we pass are not put into action promptly and employed for the veteran's benefit. It is either highly inefficient on the part of the Veterans' Administration or worse.

The following resolutions have been received from the One Hundred and First Infantry Veterans' Association:

Whereas by bitter experience, we learned that those veterans who served overseas and bore the brunt of battle were among the first to enter and among the last to be discharged from active service; and

Whereas we found most of the positions with real remuneration had been filled by those who avoided war service altogether or who had served a very short time in the armed forces in World War No. 1; and

Whereas history appears to be about to repeat itself;

We, therefore, the One Hundred and First Infantry Veterans Association, A. E. F., in convention assembled in historic Boston, September 11, 1943, hereby duly resolve that we respectfully petition the President and the congressional delegation from Massachusetts individually, to work for and provide the necessary laws that the men who actually do the fighting and bear the real brunt of the present World War No. 2 shall be adequately protected and be given at least an equal opportunity for such positions as may be open at the close of the present conflict, to those who may be honorably discharged from the armed forces of the United States.

And we do hereby further resolve that copies of this resolution shall be forwarded to the President, to the President of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the National House of Representatives, to the congressional delegation from Massachusetts, to the Governor of Massachusetts, to the President of the Massachusetts Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives in Massachusetts, and to Commissioner Rae Long, chairman of the commission to study employment problems for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

Whereas it has been found to be increasingly more difficult to obtain hospitalization for veterans with service-connected disabili-

ities and practically impossible to obtain such hospitalization in United States Government hospitals for non-service-connected veterans of World War No. 1, and,

Whereas our National Government has by various laws provided that such hospitalization should be made available to such veterans,

We, therefore, the One Hundred and First Infantry Veterans Association, A. E. F., duly resolve in convention assembled in historic Boston on September 11, 1943, to respectfully petition our President and the congressional delegation from Massachusetts to work for and provide for such adequate hospitalization facilities at once.

And be it further resolved that we respectfully petition the Governor and the legislative bodies in Massachusetts to provide for the proper extension of present hospital facilities in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts so that the present increasing need and the future hospitalization requirements of all war veterans may be fully arranged for in proper time, with courage and vision, based on past experience, to the end that the veterans of World War No. 2 will not be subjected to the overcrowding and to being cared for in places and under conditions not fit for human habitation as were numerous disabled veterans of World War No. 1.

Respectfully submitted by John W. Coughlin, K Co.

JOHN W. COUGHLIN,  
South Boston, Mass.

#### COST OF LIVING

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, the remarks of my distinguished friend and colleague from Missouri prompt me to make this statement.

I understand from Mr. Byrnes that the national income is now flowing at the rate of \$150,000,000,000 per annum. I also understand from the Department of Commerce that industrial wages and salaries will be paid for this calendar year to the tune of about \$101,000,000,000. It seems to me that if we continue to finance the war activities to the extent we are at the present time through commercial banks and continue to hesitate in enacting a tax law that will bring into the Treasury a much greater part of the funds that we are not now spending, that prices must continue to rise and bring greater disturbance and dissatisfaction among those people who are living on a fixed income and who are not participating in the flow of the war billions throughout the country. I personally believe that prices will continue to rise at a rather disastrous rate, and, therefore, it seems to me that this House should get down to the matter of passing a tax bill and getting it into operation before the end of this year. Now is the time for us to act.

#### GENERAL MARSHALL

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me reasonable that we, the

Allies, may well have reached the military phase when direction of the Supreme Allied Command should be vested in one man of military stature. In fact, I believe it to be essential to a successful prosecution of the war from now on.

If that man is to be General Marshall—and I consider him preeminently fitted—he should have as much freedom of command as possible. Certainly this in a broad sense should include both the British and American Navies and he should be able to consult with the military heads of the Chinese and Russian Governments.

The question of location of his post of command, to my mind, is secondary. That would be up to him to best determine, and if the selection of a new United States Chief of Staff or Deputy, is necessary it should be made upon his recommendation.

Mr. Speaker, I want to quote General Marshall as of this morning in saying that he greatly resents all references that have been made to his keyman, General Somervell, on the floor of this House, and in the newspapers, and that he considers it harmful to Army morale and grossly unfair to a truly great American officer.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, I concur in the statements made by the ranking minority member of the Committee on Military Affairs the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS] in his reference to General Marshall and the high-ranking officers of the War Department.

General Marshall called me at my residence this morning to express regret and deep concern at some of the statements that have appeared in local papers and also on the floor of this House. He said it was seriously affecting the war effort and authorized me and other members of the committee to quote him and to express the hope that such statements not be repeated.

He expressed the greatest confidence in General Somervell and also stated that there is complete harmony and co-operation between him and General Somervell and all the other high-ranking generals who have been mentioned on this floor and in the newspapers during the last few days. In this crucial hour I want to express my confidence in General Marshall whom I regard one of the great military leaders of the world today, and I am sure the other Members feel the same way about him. He is entitled to our full confidence, support, and co-operation. He expressed the very fervent hope that in this critical hour our statements be tempered with fairness and tolerance and above all with truth based upon official facts. General Marshall says the appointment, promotion, or assignment of any and all Army officers is without political consideration or influence. The President accepts the recommendation of himself and the Secretary of War.

General Marshall is willing, although a very busy man, to appear before any committee or to speak to any Member of this House about it and he denies the base political charges that have been made, and as the gentleman from New

York [Mr. ANDREWS] states, resents the untruths and exaggerated statements that have been made on this floor and in the press. I think it is time to cut out the bickering and little stuff and back up our great Chief of Staff and get this war over with and our boys back home.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] is recognized.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, along the line of the discussion that is now taking place with respect to numerous remarks about the War Department, let me say that I spent something like a quarter of an hour in conference with General Marshall this morning, from 7:45 to 8 o'clock. We went over this whole situation thoroughly.

He authorized me to say to anybody interested or in answer to any inquiry that there was complete harmony among the high officials of the War Department and the administration, and that anything that was done was done with his approval.

I think he should have made that statement and I heartily concur in the idea that General Marshall should be permitted to run the War Department as long as he is Chief of Staff. To my mind he is the ideal man for that position. To me he is the most capable man we have had in years as Chief of Staff of the United States Army, and at this time when the Army is expanding so rapidly, when its responsibilities throughout the world are momentous, and when our men are fighting to the death on all world fronts, I know of no man in public life more qualified to head the General Staff of the Army of the United States. The way Gen. George C. Marshall has handled the affairs of the Army in this crucial time gratifies me. In my judgment as long as General Marshall is the Chief of the General Staff of the United States Army we are in safe hands. I have found it wise in the past to follow the advice of this great military leader and for the duration of this war and until we achieve victory as we surely will, I shall continue to feel that we are fortunate indeed in our leadership of our armed forces.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, every one of us, every American, have great responsibilities imposed upon us during this particular crisis. Each and every one of us is a Member of a body of 435 persons honored by the people of a district to represent them in the National House of Representatives—435 out of 133,000,000 persons. We in particular have a grave responsibility imposed upon us because we occupy a position of direct responsibility and trust.

Mr. Speaker, I have been very much concerned about some of the statements made lately. I am not going to criticize, because to recriminate would not do any good; but I hope that statements made in the future will be with a tolerant regard for our responsibility as American citizens and as Members of the National House of Representatives.

This morning I had an interview with Secretary of War Stimson, not on this matter but on another matter, and during the interview I took occasion to call to his attention certain statements which appeared in the press recently, Secretary Stimson—and he is an honorable gentleman, a fine American, and, although we may not agree with him in all things, every one of us respect him as a gentleman and as a fine American and a fine public official—Secretary Stimson stated this, and I quote him:

The President has absolutely refrained from interfering in any way with the War Department and in the choice of any generals of the United States Army, and in their assignments to duty. The President has followed the advice of his military advisers in the consideration of all questions of strategy which have governed the war, and so far as his intrusion in any political or personal way it has been absolutely nonexistent.

He also said I was authorized to say that the President—and I know this personally, so I did not have to get this information from Secretary Stimson, but he said this to me and I know it personally:

The President has a very high regard for General Marshall and profoundly respects him and his ability.

Let us hope that in the future we shall have no more intolerant expressions.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I have two requests.

On yesterday, I secured permission to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to insert an analysis of veterans' legislation passed at this session of the Congress, which is very far-reaching and involves questions that are daily being propounded to every Member of Congress. This analysis has been prepared by the Veterans' Administration. The Government Printing Office informs me it will cost \$420. Under the circumstances I think it is well worth it and I ask unanimous consent to include it in the RECORD under those conditions.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

#### MARSHALL FIELD—THE MOST FAVORED CITIZEN IN AMERICA

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, while practically everyone in the United States

is being taxed to the limit to help finance the war, while we are calling upon everyone to buy bonds and make sacrifices, and while mothers and fathers throughout the land who are shedding tears and offering prayers for the safety of their sons in the service are digging into their meager purses and depriving themselves of many of the mere necessities in order to aid the war effort, we have one citizen of this country who is today favored beyond the dreams of avarice. I refer to Marshall Field 3d, the Chicago playboy. Today he comes into possession of between \$70,000,000 and \$75,000,000 on which he will pay not one cent of income or inheritance taxes.

I have tried for months to reach that estate through a bill which I have prepared and introduced, but have failed to get results. It is not only escaping taxation entirely, but just think of the purpose for which it is being used. It is being used to finance the publication and distribution of PM—that uptown edition of the Communist Daily Worker that is waging its daily scurrilous attacks on Cordell Hull, our great Secretary of State, and one of the outstanding statesmen of the world.

This money is being used to finance this publication that is continually attacking and attempting to smear the Members of the Congress of the United States, and stirring up race trouble throughout the land, and it is today encouraging the Negroes of Washington to storm the white restaurant in this Capitol.

All this is being paid for by Marshall Field, the most favored citizen in America, who today comes into possession of this additional amount of \$70,000,000 or \$75,000,000, of which he never earned a nickel, and on which he will not pay one cent of income or inheritance taxes.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to include in my remarks two telegrams.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. COFFEE]?

There was no objection.

#### DIVERSION OF COTTON LINTERS

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I take this time of the House briefly to call attention to the fact that the Northwest Furniture Manufacturers' Association, representing all of the furniture factories in that area, is very much concerned at the prospective or projected order to be issued by the War Production Board diverting all cotton linters produced in this season not required for chemical and ammunition purposes to the paper and pulp trade on the ground there is a grave shortage of wood pulp for paper manufacture.

The effect of the diversion of cotton linters from the Northwest industries will mean they will have to utilize substitutes which are not practical and which would give the public a poor article. The Northwest furniture manufacturers are engaged almost 100 per cent in the manufacture of mattresses

and varied furnishings for the armed services. The diversion of cotton linters would have a very deleterious effect on the industry.

The following are two telegrams I have received relative to the subject:

TACOMA, WASH., September 28, 1943.

JOHN M. COFFEE,

Congressman, Washington, D. C.:

The Northwest Furniture Manufacturers' Association representing majority of furniture factories this area vitally interested in meeting being held today conducted by Harold Boeschstein, War Production Board, room 3006, Railroad Retirement Building, Washington. This meeting held to consider delivery all cotton linters produced this season not required for chemical munition purposes to paper-pulp trade in view of shortage wood pulp for paper manufacture. We were unaware of this meeting until today and if not watched closely may lead to possible contract by Government agency of entire season's production of linters for one or both purposes if decision is rendered permitting all linters not going to chemical munitions industries to paper-pulp trade it would result in no linters being available for bedding and furniture trade, thereby greatly increasing existing difficulties involved in furnishing thousands of war housing units and bedding for armed forces in this and other areas. We believe that contemplated action entirely unnecessary and unfair to furniture and bedding manufacturers who are doing their utmost to furnish essential furniture for war housing and bedding for armed forces. Your support in preventing unfavorable action will be greatly appreciated as it is evident immediate action necessary.

NORTHWEST FURNITURE

MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION,  
RUFUS T. DAVIS.

TACOMA, WASH., September 28, 1943.

JOHN COFFEE,

Representative, Washington, D. C.:

Understand meeting being held by Harold Boeschstein, 3006 Railroad Retirement Building, to secure use of cotton linters while making pulp for paper industry. Such diversion of linters from mattress and furniture business will greatly increase the cost of mattresses to the public and the Government and will interfere with an established practice. Trust you will oppose this move as it will force the use of waste and other substitutes in our business which are not as practical and gives the public a poor article.

LEO GALLAGHER,

Owner, Sound Mattress and Felt Co.

#### MARSHALL FIELD

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] call attention to the fact that Mr. Marshall Field will today come into possession of many millions of dollars. May I say to him that the money is an inheritance that accumulated and was made possible by reason of the business policy and farsightedness of his grandfather many, many years ago, who had confidence in the future progress of Chicago. I further say to the gentleman that the opportunity of

accumulating wealth in Chicago is still there today.

As to the tax upon this inheritance, I will say to the gentleman that every dollar of payment called for by law—whether it be from a city, county, State, or Federal tax office—will be paid. I can assure him that Mr. Field is an honest man and at no time has he been charged with attempting to evade payment of taxes. That cannot be said of many other men who have accumulated wealth.

From time to time Mr. Field has suffered criticism at the hands of the gentleman from Mississippi because the newspapers which he publishes—the New York PM and the Chicago Sun—are fearless in their criticism of persons whose activities warrant the searchlight of publicity and an exposé of conditions inimical to the best interest of the people of our country and to the country itself. Mr. Field has stood foursquare behind that policy. However, I do not wish to infer that I approve of everything that is carried in these papers because I cannot subscribe to some of their articles relative to our great Secretary of State, whom I have had the honor to know for 37 years. He has proven an honest and efficient official in every position in which he has served.

It is also true that PM has criticized some Members of the House, especially those whom it believes have not fully cooperated in the war effort. Both newspapers devote a great deal of space to the colored people of our country and other peoples who have been discriminated against and it is this, perhaps, to which the gentleman from Mississippi mostly vents his resentment. I do not have many colored people in my district and I do not call attention to this matter for political reasons. It does appear, however, that most of them are still being misled in voting the Republican ticket. It is my observation, Mr. Speaker, and I am pleased to stand here today and say that the colored people in Chicago have conducted themselves properly, they are law abiding, and there have been no such disturbances as have occurred in other cities, and I trust there never will be any.

Mr. Speaker, Chicago for years had only one Chicago morning newspaper which was extremely antagonistic to the New Deal and to the President. To bring home a true and factual presentation of news to the people of Chicago, Mr. Marshall Field, believing in fair play and because of his interests in Chicago, established a Chicago morning newspaper—the Chicago Sun. While I was hopeful that it would be a Democratic daily, it is really independent in its policies and editorials. It prints the truth regardless of who it hits. Yes, it has even published that my record in answering House roll calls is low. I owe nothing to Mr. Marshall Field, but being from Chicago and knowing well the splendid reputation enjoyed by the Field family over a period of many, many years, I feel that the criticisms on the part of the gentleman from Mississippi are unwarranted and not in keeping with a spirit of fair play. I am confident that

if he were to read not only the New York PM, but the Chicago Sun as well, he would come to the conclusion that it is disseminating impartial and unbiased news to the people.

#### AGAINST THE DRAFTING OF FATHERS

Mr. Speaker, it is to be regretted that my statements made on the floor and given to the press have been misinterpreted, especially the misquoting of letters which I directed to General Hershey, of the Selective Service System, and the replies which I received from him, relative to what I believed to be unfair draft exemptions and opposing the drafting of fathers.

On September 17, 1943, I addressed a letter to Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, Director of the Selective Service System, in which I enclosed a letter which I received from Mr. Harry Alexander Ash, of Chicago. To correct the misquoting of my position, I refer to the letter addressed to General Hershey which I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD together with the letter of Mr. Ash which appears in the Appendix of the RECORD on page A3881.

My statement was to the effect that all unmarried men should be drafted, married men without families up to 30 years of age, and men who have married since the beginning of the war up to 25 years of age, and, later on, if necessary, to extend the age limit of this class to 30 years.

I voted for the conscription bill and the selective-service draft bill, but I do not set myself up above the efficient and experienced officers of the Army who know what our soldier requirements should be, and there is no endeavor to force my views upon them. After all, it is their duty and responsibility—and we know it is a grave one—and we must depend upon their knowledge and experience to decide what is required to win the war.

I regret that people do not seem to be aware of the fact that the House voted favorably on the Kilday bill, which provides for the drafting of single men before fathers are drafted into the service. This bill passed the House on April 12 and has been in the Senate for the past 5 months, and I cannot understand why, at this late hour, certain Senators are making such an issue of this matter.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a poem written by William Stanley Dunford.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ROBINSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an address by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] the majority leader, at a meeting of the Dorchester Board of Trade, Dorchester, Mass., on September 9.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLISON of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an extract from an address made by the Reverend W. W. Judd, on the subject of the church and racial relations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. ELLISON]?

There was no objection.

#### OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, first, I should like to suggest to our friends from St. Louis that if they are interested in seeing that their people are adequately fed, it might be well these days, when we do not seem to have so very much to do here in the House, that they could first get behind the Christian Herter bill, that revives the stamp plan for the low-income groups; second, that they help the rural areas to get out of the clutches of the rulings of the O. P. A. and the Food Distribution Administration and other governmental agencies that evidently are not interested in the spirit of the law or in the word of the law; third, provide a food-production program that will produce food in abundance instead of the one we have had up to this time; and, fourth, help pass House Joint Resolution 155, that will, or should, help provide additional feeds.

With that constructive idea in mind, I have written today to Chester Bowles, evidently Director of the O. P. A., as follows:

SEPTEMBER 28, 1943.

Mr. CHESTER BOWLES,  
Director, Office of Price Administration,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BOWLES: Assuming that you would welcome constructive suggestions in connection with the operations of the O. P. A. I am taking this opportunity of expressing to you some of the suggestions which I obtained during the 2 months of close contact which I had with the county O. P. A.'s and the citizens of the Seventh Wisconsin Congressional District.

The public seems to feel that the O. P. A. has shown signs in the past of being more interested in making America over than it is in making our country strong and have lately shown more desire to put over their schemes and controlling profits than they have been in helping to produce and distribute equally the food of the Nation. However, there is a prevailing sympathy for, and support of, the objectives of the O. P. A. The public feels there is a need to protect the weak from the strong and the man without the price from certain individuals and groups who have the price.

If the O. P. A. were properly administered it could command the respect, cooperation, and admiration of the people.

A few of the suggestions obtained in a district largely agricultural, where the rural people have not had any E flags for their most excellent contributions to the war effort, are as follows:

1. Much more satisfactory results would be obtained if the spirit of the law, as well as the word of the law, were followed by the most numerous employees of the O. P. A.

Section 2, paragraph (h) of the Price Control Act is as follows: "The powers granted in this section shall not be used or made to operate to compel changes in the business practices, cost practices or methods, or means or aids to distribution, established in any industry, except to prevent circumvention or evasion of any regulation, order, price schedule, or requirement under this act."

It is more apparent each day that the war effort would be helped if all O. P. A. employees in high and low places, showed more familiarity with this section of the law.

You no doubt are familiar with the pressure groups that tried to have the O. P. A. enforce grade labeling in spite of the above mentioned paragraph of the Price Control Act. You no doubt are familiar with the fact that high policy making officials of the O. P. A. itself, like Dr. Galbraith, appeared before the Agricultural Committee of the House and tried to justify grade labeling in spite of this section of the law.

2. The county O. P. A. in rural sections feel, and it apparently is in keeping with the facts, that the O. P. A. rulings were formulated largely from the urban standpoint. For example, no adequate provision is made for emergency needs and demands for meat for threshing, silo filling and potato digging. Sugar for these same emergency needs has not been provided equally in adjoining counties, resulting in unnecessary ill feeling. Country butchers and farmers have been harassed by illegal, senseless rulings by letter from minor officials on the pay rolls of other Federal agencies and your organization is being held responsible and being criticized when it had no part in the high-handed, nonsensical performances of these little people in big places.

3. While the O. P. A. is supposed to be distributing food equally to all groups of our citizens, this is not being done. The way it is being handled now is, for the lack of a more expressive and permissible term, most ridiculously unfair. The man with the price gets about what he wants. The average man with a family has to pay points for the cheap meats such as bologna, side pork, sowbelly and even a lowly soupbone, while the man with the price can provide himself with the choice meats of the land. As long as the man with the price can obtain his fill of the choicest meats without points, it would appear that since these cheaper cuts are largely consumed by people doing manual labor, it would be only fair to remove these points from the soupbones, bologna, side pork, and sowbelly. Why does the O. P. A. support a program that allows people with the price to buy unlimited quantities of fluid milk, but rations evaporated milk, cheese, and butter, which are made from fluid milk?

4. My fourth suggestion is to immediately amend the ruling in regard to farm butchering where the farmers live in villages and cities and who supervise their own farms. Mr. Maurice Wolk of the O. P. A. advises me that such a change in rulings is under consideration. The sooner this amendment is made the better.

5. The roll-back of butter is having and will continue to have a harmful influence on the war food program. Production of butter is not being maintained. This roll-back of butter has resulted in less powdered skim milk so needed at this time. The O. P. A. and the W. F. A. will have to answer to public opinion for the disruption of the war food program. There is a very evident desire to roll back the bureaus here in Washington.

6. There is still too much of a demonstration of the passion to ration instead of a correct approach to attain the real objectives of the O. P. A.

7. My contacts with the county O. P. A.'s convinces me that the county O. P. A. boards can be depended upon for a more practical approach than the rulings handed down from Washington. There is too much of an attitude that all integrity and all intelligence emanates from Washington when the facts are that the county O. P. A. boards are composed of men with much more practical experience and business experience, than most of the men giving them the orders from Washington.

8. The rural people feel there has been altogether too much emphasis put on inflation as far as the food producers are concerned. They feel that their gross annual incomes are not such a threat to inflation. They feel that the only time inflation is mentioned is when the low income groups are involved or when the American farmer is in the picture. They know that Federal employees receiving from \$2,900 to \$12,000 a year had an increase in salary to meet the increased cost of living without a word of publicly recorded protest from James Byrnes, Marvin Jones, Fred Vinson, the O. P. A. or the W. L. B., so they can see no reason to be overly disturbed as to the effect of their meager net incomes on the inflation spiral. Since only 40 percent of the farm homes even have electric lights and since only one out of ten of the farm homes has a bath tub, they are rather tired of hearing people with five to fifty times their net incomes, and with two to five times their hourly wages, accusing them of causing inflation.

9. While some citizens seemed to feel that the O. P. A. was increasing its pay rolls for political purposes, most thinking people realize that this cannot be done without an unfavorable public reaction. There are so many sons and daughters in the armed forces, the public will not tolerate cheap political activities.

I note in the press that a prominent office holder from Oklahoma has written you advising that the O. P. A. is liable to lose the election in 1944. I am not so interested in the influence of the O. P. A. on any political party, as I am interested in seeing it used as an agency to help win the war. It is for that reason that I oppose the activities that are so harmful to the war food program.

10. The O. P. A. is blamed for situations that are the result of rulings by other Federal agencies. In fact the most irritating, unlawful rulings and proposals I observed during the recess of Congress recently, were issued by the War Food Administration and other governmental agencies, and the O. P. A. was being blamed for them. I realize that you have inherited the responsibilities of the O. P. A. and none of these suggestions are written with any personal reference to any individual.

We should have a coordination of agencies or we are apparently not going to live up to our obligations in producing the food for the war and distributing it fairly to our own people. The war food program needs the cooperation of all groups. It needs this cooperation very, very badly.

I trust you will accept this letter in the spirit in which it is meant and hoping to have the privilege of making your acquaintance, I am

Sincerely yours,

REID F. MURRAY,  
Member of Congress.

PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina.  
Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina.  
Mr. Speaker, I deem the occasion an appropriate one to express some approbation of another great servant of the people of the United States. I have listened with great pleasure to the defense, as you might call it, of General Marshall and the great group of generals that surround him and other officials; and, representing the people of one of the 435 districts of this Republic represented here, and, I believe, a majority of the people of the United States, I want to say, God bless the Commander in Chief of our armies and navies, the President of the United States, Franklin D. Roosevelt, the greatest leader that ever carried any people through a great conflagration in all history.

PUERTO RICO—MESSAGE FROM THE  
PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES  
(H. DOC. NO. 304)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Insular Affairs and ordered to be printed:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

When sovereignty over Puerto Rico was transferred from Spain to the United States in 1899, the Treaty of Paris did not settle the exact position of Puerto Rico in the orbit of American sovereignty. It left that for determination by the Congress of the United States. After a brief interval of military government, the Foraker Act of 1900 established a framework of colonial government. Under it the legislative assembly was given rather limited powers; and the Governor and an appointed executive council held the real substance of authority. The inhabitants were to be citizens of Puerto Rico—American nationals, but not citizens.

In 1917 the Puerto Ricans received full American citizenship. At the same time the Congress, by the Organic Act of Puerto Rico, created a full-fledged legislature, and provided for a much greater participation by Puerto Ricans in the executive department of the government, reserving to the President the power of appointment of only the Governor, the attorney general, the commissioner of education, the auditor, and the justices of the supreme court. This action of the Congress in 1917 bound Puerto Rico much more closely to the United States, and provided a substantial advance in local self-government.

During the 45 years which have passed since the occupation of the island by the United States the economic situation of the Puerto Rican people, although materially improved in some respects, has not changed in essential character. Instead of development toward economic self-reliance, there has been a steady tendency to become more dependent upon outside markets for disposal of the single great crop—sugar—and upon outside sources for food, clothing, building mate-

rials, and most of the other necessities. Partly because of economic and geographical factors and partly because of tariff preferences and shipping laws, these relationships are by now almost wholly with the continental United States.

The population of Puerto Rico has increased from 950,000 to about 2,000,000, making this one of the most densely inhabited areas on earth. Depending upon the obligation implied by our active participation in their development, Puerto Ricans have been encouraged, insofar as they could, to try to attain American standards of life. Wages in Puerto Rico, for instance, are several times as high as those in nearby islands not under our flag; literacy is much higher than in other Caribbean islands; the percentage of those who speak English has grown progressively in every decade; our agencies of public health have made inroads on diseases endemic in the island; and serious attempts have been and are being made to provide better housing and to raise the levels of nutrition.

During the 45 years of our sovereignty the elements of world military and naval strategy have changed also. When the island was first brought under our flag, the Panama Canal had not yet been dug, and the airplane had not yet been invented. The Caribbean was something of a backwater in the broad current of world affairs. When the present war became imminent, however, it was obvious that the chain of islands running in a great arc from Florida to the shoulder of South America, enclosing the Caribbean Sea, formed a vast natural shield for the Panama Canal, suited in distance and conformation to the uses of the military plane. And of this island shield, Puerto Rico is the center. Its possession or control by any foreign power—or even the remote threat of such possession—would be repugnant to the most elementary principles of national defense.

It has long been the policy of the Government of the United States progressively to reinforce the machinery of self-government in its Territories and island possessions. The principles for which we are now fighting require that we should recognize the right of all our citizens—whether continental or overseas—to the greatest possible degree of home rule and also of participation in the benefits and responsibilities of our Federal system.

Puerto Ricans of all political parties, however divergent their views as to the political future of the island, are united in asking for the right to elect their own Governor. I believe that they are entitled to it.

The Congress will recall that on March 9 of this year, I recommended to it "that it consider as soon as possible an amendment of the organic law of Puerto Rico to permit the people of Puerto Rico to elect their own Governor and to redefine the functions and powers of the Federal Government and of the Government of Puerto Rico, respectively." In order to assist in framing the required legislation, in case the Congress should decide to grant this power to the people of Puerto Rico, I appointed a committee composed

of an equal number of Puerto Ricans and continental residents. I requested them to make a study of the amendments to the organic act necessary to authorize the election of a Governor and to redefine the relationships of the Federal and Insular Governments affected thereby.

That committee met in Washington almost daily for 3 weeks this last summer. It has sent me a full report of its recommendations in the form of a proposed bill and a summary statement of such bill.

I am forwarding this report of the committee to the Congress for consideration by them. The legislation was drawn by the committee itself, and I am submitting it as a possible guide for such action as the Congress may decide to take.

Under this bill the people of Puerto Rico would be given an opportunity for the free exercise of the powers of local self-government in all three branches of government—executive, legislative, and judicial. There would be reserved to the President the power to veto only such measures passed by the legislature as were beyond the proper field of local self-government. There would be a United States Commissioner General in Puerto Rico upon whom would devolve the responsibility for the execution of the laws of the United States, and for the coordination and supervision of the activities of Federal civilian agencies, and their correlation with the activities of insular agencies. He would also have authority to require reports of all activities of the insular government for transmittal to the President through the Secretary of the Interior. The fiscal relationship of the insular government to the Federal Government would not be altered, nor would the ultimate power of Congress to legislate for the Territory. The people of the island would, however, be given assurance of the intention of Congress to obtain the concurrence of the people of the island before imposing upon them any further changes in the organic act.

There is no reason why their Governor and other officials should continue to be appointed from without. At this stage of Puerto Rican development the withholding of this right is no longer necessary. There is no question of Puerto Ricans' ability now to administer their own internal affairs and to assume the attendant responsibility.

It is recommended by the report of the committee that this fact be recognized at once. I agree that this should be done and suggest that the Congress should consider it as a matter of right and justice for Puerto Ricans.

As to the future, it is not proposed that the political development of Puerto Rico be left to chance. On the contrary, it is recommended by the committee that a continuing joint advisory council, under the chairmanship of the Secretary of the Interior, be appointed to conduct continuing economic and political studies of all the elements of the Puerto Rican situation and of American necessities, to guide us for the future. This council must report at least once during the life of each Congress.

In addition to the Secretary of the Interior, the council would consist of the

Governor of Puerto Rico and the Commissioner General, who shall serve ex officio, and also four persons to be appointed by the President of the United States, and five persons to be appointed by the Governor of Puerto Rico.

The government of Puerto Rico should not be static; it should be changed and developed as conditions warrant. It is equally important that the economic situation of the Puerto Ricans should be improved. I am confident that with patience and cooperation both these objectives can be attained.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, September 28, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] is recognized for 15 minutes.

#### FREE SPEECH IN AMERICA

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I had intended to take this time today to speak upon the farm problem. I had intended to urge that the ceiling price upon corn of \$1.07 a bushel be removed so that the farmers in the East, the poultrymen and the dairymen, might get some of the middle-western corn. We have a very desperate situation in the Eastern States, particularly in New York and in my section, and I propose to speak upon that issue next week.

Instead, today I want to answer a resolution which was adopted by the American Legion at its national convention in Omaha, criticizing me for allegedly abusing my franking privilege.

No one is a more loyal supporter of the Legion than I am and will continue to be in spite of this action, which is totally erroneous upon its part, and which was taken without affording me any opportunity to answer these false charges and implications.

Since, however, the American Legion has inadvertently permitted persons who have been engaged in a concerted smear campaign against me and other pre-war noninterventionists to use that organization for their own political purposes, and caused the adoption of a resolution based on an utterly false premise, wherein I was censured for "abuse of the congressional franking privilege," I wish to take this opportunity to give the facts to the House.

In the first place I want to state again, and again, and again that I have never permitted anyone to use my frank to send out any speeches that were prepared by someone else; only my own speeches have been distributed, and they have always been 100-percent American.

My outspoken opposition to Gestapo methods in America, and my efforts to uphold the Bill of Rights and the Constitution has invoked the enmity and animosity of certain persons who would destroy every vestige of freedom of speech in America. I consider it an honor to be attacked by such sources as Walter Winchell, the Washington Post, the Communist Daily Worker, and PM, but deplore the fact that such a great American organization as the Legion can be made use of to smear its own members without a hearing. However, since these persons

have now infiltrated into one of our greatest veterans organizations, and have used its great prestige for their own purposes, I feel I should again present the facts to the Congress and the American people.

I emphatically deny the alleged abuse of the franking privilege as set forth in the American Legion resolution. Had there been any opportunity to present the facts to the Legion committee, I am confident that I would have easily convinced them of the falsity of these manufactured charges; but no such opportunity was afforded me. The resolution was sponsored by yet-unknown individuals and aimed against me and other Members of Congress who happened to oppose our entrance into war before Pearl Harbor, and who have been unafraid to stand up and fight for freedom of speech in America, while supporting all war measures since war was declared.

It is a sad commentary that such an organization as the American Legion—of which I have been proud to be a member since World War No. 1 and was chairman of the subcommittee which drafted the preamble to the American Legion constitution which has never been changed one iota to the present time—should permit itself to be used even inadvertently for political and smear purposes. It is even more to be deplored that it should permit its great name to be linked with any effort designed to destroy free speech in America and to deny to American citizens the rights guaranteed to them under the Constitution.

I also want to reply to an editorial appearing in the Washington Post. In its editorial, dated September 25, 1943, the Post, as usual, distorts the facts concerning a speech I sent out last summer in behalf of the freedom of speech, on which the American Legion resolution was based, and quotes section 335 of the United States Code, that—

It shall be unlawful for any person entitled under the law to use of a frank to lend said frank or permit its use by any committee, organization, or association, or permit its use by any person for the benefit or use of any such committee, organization, or association.

By this inference, it is claimed that I used my frank for such purposes, which is contrary to the fact. No person, organization, committee, or association has ever used my frank in this manner, and I do not even know the individual C. Leon De Aryan to whom the Post refers, nor do I know of any organization or association with which he may be connected.

I did make a speech in the House in behalf of the preservation of the freedom of speech in America—mind you, not in time of war but in peacetime—as was clearly set forth in this speech—April 6, 1943, in behalf of H. R. 2352, proposing amendments to the Alien and Sedition Act and to make it conform to the Bill of Rights and the Constitution in time of peace.

My position is that if anyone desires to send out my speeches and wishes to join in combating the efforts of any Federal agency to deprive American citizens of their privileges under the Bill

of Rights and the Constitution, I shall welcome their support and am always glad to have them quote from or send out any speeches I have made on that vital issue. I had several thousand copies of my remarks printed, at my own expense, and sent them out to anyone who requested copies, already inserted and sealed in envelopes, in accordance with the time-honored practice and custom of Members of the House and Senate.

Anyone, white or colored, Protestant, Catholic, or Jew, Republican, Democrat, New Dealer, Socialist, or Communist, arrested, indicted, or convicted, in jail or out, may, as far as I am concerned receive or send out any of my speeches, because they are good American doctrine, in the interest of the United States, and 100-percent American.

There is not one word—and I challenged anyone to prove otherwise—that is even by indirection subversive or un-American.

I want to quote from the speech that the American Legion, the Washington Post, the Daily Worker, and the PM have objected to, as I do not know of any speech of which I am more proud or believe is more needed at the present time. I only wish I had enough money myself to send out a million copies in the Nation. If there was ever a 100-percent American speech, it is this one. It refers only to peacetime and does not apply after war has been declared. It in no way prevents the prosecution of persons for unlawful acts, and merely endeavors to protect the right of free speech and of a free press in America in time of peace.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I ask unanimous consent to insert extracts from that speech which I delivered in the House on Tuesday, April 6, 1943.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. The extracts to which I refer—and I only wish I had time to read the entire speech—are as follows:

The peacetime sedition law of 1940 was aimed specifically at preventing the distribution of handbills and propaganda to cause disaffection and mutiny on board warships and disobedience and desertion in our armed forces; and should not, by any stretch of interpretation by the Department of Justice, be applied to editorials or to statements and speeches by American citizens exercising their constitutional right and ancient fireside privilege of commenting on or criticizing the administration, the President, the New Deal, the foreign policies of the President and of Congress prior to Pearl Harbor, or racial or religious issues, or the conduct of the war.

It is utterly preposterous to attempt to twist and distort the 1940 act into indicting and bringing to trial opponents of the administration's foreign policies or of President Roosevelt, or anti-New Dealers, anti-Communists, or anti-Semites.

In a letter written to Mrs. John Adams, written at the end of his first term in the Presidency, Thomas Jefferson stated:

"I discharged every person under punishment or prosecution under the sedition law because I considered and now consider that law to be a nullity, as absolute and as palpable as if Congress had ordered us to fall down and worship a golden image, and that

it was as much my duty to arrest its execution in every stage as it would have been to rescue from the fiery furnace those who should have been cast into it for refusing to worship the image." (Thomas Jefferson, by Albert Jay Nock, p. 230.)

The golden calf in the present instance is the foreign policy of the New Deal administration prior to Pearl Harbor, and those who failed to fall down and worship it before Pearl Harbor are being charged, and in some instances, indicted under the provisions of the present-day Sedition Act, 1940.

Fair-minded Americans, regardless of party affiliations, will never remain silent and permit freedom of speech or a free press—without which free America ceases to exist—to be curbed and gagged, or opponents of the foreign policies of President Roosevelt prior to Pearl Harbor—who numbered 100,000,000—sent to jail through bold distortion of the peacetime sedition law and the intent of the Congress.

If American citizens, clergymen, editors, writers, and crackpots or cranks from all parts of the Nation can be brought to Washington and tried for expressing their noninterventionist and anti-New Deal views prior to Pearl Harbor, half of Congress and 80 percent of the American people could be sent to prison under such a Gestapo procedure.

I am informed that there is a group of anti-Semites among the 34 Americans indicted. I do not approve of their words or actions, as I believe there should be no religious test under the Constitution, and that all American citizens, regardless of race or color, have a right to their own religious convictions. But while anti-Semitism is un-American, I know of no Federal law or constitutional provision that prohibits freedom of discussion of racial and religious issues, as much as I deplore them. It certainly was not the intent of Congress to write any such restriction or limitation into the Alien Registration and Sedition Act of July 28, 1940.

This issue is so important that it far exceeds all party lines. It is a great American issue, involving the most fundamental and precious of all American rights and liberties—that of freedom of speech. No sacrifice is too great to safeguard freedom of speech and of the press—symbols of freedom in America. We are fighting a war all over the world for these very principles and must not permit them to be destroyed here at home.

To sum up, this speech and the legislation I proposed coincides very closely with an amendment offered by me on the floor of the House to another bill, which was adopted, and reads as follows:

Nothing in this act shall be construed to prevent any citizen or citizens, or any newspaper or other publications, at any time, from freely discussing or openly criticizing the domestic or foreign policies of the administration or the Federal Government, or any public official, or from discussing or criticizing any existing or proposed law, regulation, directive, or Executive order.

The following resolution passed by the Judson P. Galloway Post, No. 152, the American Legion, of Newburgh, N. Y., the largest post in my district, was adopted by a unanimous vote, with one single exception. That post has sent its resolution of protest through the channels to the national organization. I did not see it until it appeared in the Newburgh News. I knew nothing about it except as I read it in the local newspaper and as

it was handed to me afterward, because I was not in my district at the time.

The resolution reads as follows:

THE AMERICAN LEGION,  
JUDSON P. GALLOWAY POST, No. 152,  
Newburgh, N. Y.

"Whereas the American Legion, in national convention assembled, at Omaha, Nebr., has passed a resolution questioning the patriotism and loyalty of one of our post members; and

"Whereas the said target of this attack, HAMILTON FISH, has proven that his patriotism and loyalty to his country in war and in peace are beyond reproach; and

"Whereas the said HAMILTON FISH was one of the founders of the American Legion and coauthor of the preamble to its constitution; and

"Whereas the record will prove that he was one of the first of our national legislators to fight the subversive groups forming the Communist Party in the United States, and that he further did much to crush their early attempts to defame and disrupt our form of government and in so doing he did expose their plans and purposes: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That we, the members of Judson P. Galloway Post, No. 152, the American Legion, Newburgh, N. Y., wish to be recorded in protest to this action, and we further resolve that no such action should be taken in a free and democratic organization like the American Legion against one of its members without first giving the said member a hearing. Loyalty and service to the American Legion and the United States of America deserves fairer treatment, and this action appears like an attempt to cooperate with those elements which are spreading disunity in the Nation in time of war, and with those groups which would smother free speech and thus create in the United States of America the very type of dictatorship which the war is being fought to destroy; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded through the necessary channels to the national commander of the American Legion for consideration and appropriate action."

The above resolution was adopted at a regular meeting of Judson P. Galloway Post, No. 152, the American Legion, Newburgh, N. Y., on Thursday evening, September 23, 1943.

IRVING NESS,

Commander.

JAMES M. FLANAGAN,

Adjutant.

I have received other resolutions from war veterans' organizations along the same line. After I read in a New York newspaper the resolution adopted by the Legion at Omaha, I gave out the following statement which I propose to read in full to the Members of the House of Representatives, as it involves the right of free speech and the use of the franking privilege of every Member of Congress.

It is more in sorrow than in anger that I have read in the newspapers that the Legion, a great American organization, of which I am proud to be a member, has inadvertently been used to carry on a political and partisan smear campaign by repeating charges more than 3 years old, that I permitted my congressional frank to be used to spread un-American or subversive propaganda by the America First Committee, and George Sylvester Viereck, without one iota of evidence or any hearing on my part whatsoever.

Both these charges are completely and totally false, and I denounced them as manufactured lies years ago. Neither the America First Committee nor Mr. Viereck ever asked to use my congressional frank, or ever used it to send out any subversive speeches, nor did either write or suggest any speeches for me. I think everybody knows that I write my own speeches, and there is not a subversive or un-American thought in any speech I ever made in Congress or elsewhere. I never met nor have I seen Mr. Leon de Aryan, of San Diego, who is alleged to have addressed and sent out one or more of my speeches in April of this year entitled "Making the Peacetime Alien Sedition Law Conform to Bill of Rights and the Constitution," dealing almost entirely with the preservation of free speech and free press in time of peace and not affecting the situation in any way after war has been declared. I challenge anyone to find a single un-American word, thought, or ideal in that speech. I sent one to every Member of Congress, and as soon as I can get more printed I will send a copy to every American Legion delegate to the Omaha Convention, and will eat my hat if there is anything subversive in it unless free speech has become un-American. The Legion evidently did not know that my proposed free-speech bill was not effective in time of war. We are fighting a war to maintain free speech all over the world, and the sole purpose of my bill was to maintain it in America in peacetime. That is the fire-side privilege of every American citizen. I do not know without checking up how many of these speeches on free speech and a free press were mailed out, but there were not very many as I recollect that the printing bill was under \$50. There were some favorable editorials and comments on it throughout the Nation at the time, and I received numerous letters of commendation. I hold no brief for Mr. De Aryan, as I know nothing about him except that under American jurisprudence no American is guilty of any unlawful act until convicted. I am told that his newspaper, the Broom, which I do not subscribe to and have no connection with, is still being published, and if it were subversive it would have been closed by the Government long ago.

It would be interesting to know, and I propose to find out, who originated this false and scurrilous attack. I have my own ideas now, but will take steps to ascertain the facts and to act accordingly.

I shall be glad to cooperate with the American Legion to prevent any abuse of the franking privilege. I doubt if there is a single legionnaire who has more openly and more consistently opposed subversive and un-American activities during the 22 years I have been in Congress, and will continue to do so.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Under previous order of the House heretofore agreed to, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF] for 15 minutes.

#### REALITIES CONCERNING THE POST-WAR WORLD

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, there are 12 fundamental points upon which it is important that we be advised concerning our foreign policy. It is important that we be advised of these 12 fundamental points, because we, the American taxpayers, will have to pay the bill. We and our children and our children's children will have to toil and sweat, sacrifice, deny ourselves, and endure privations in order to meet even a comparatively small part of the post-war plans of some who would impose upon us those which they have in mind.

These 12 fundamental points require our careful study because they vitally affect our future and the fate of coming American generations.

The first point is that, of course, the United States will fulfill all of her proper and actual responsibilities in and to the post-war world. Those obligations will not necessarily be what some group, seeking world power, may say they will be, or what some individual, seeking world renown, may want to make them.

The second point is that it is too early to blueprint in detail what those responsibilities will be. We do not yet know what kind of a post-war world will confront us. We do not know whether the war both on the Atlantic and the Pacific will end simultaneously, or whether there will be a year or two years or a longer period between the terminations of the war across the Atlantic and our war on the Pacific.

We do not know what conditions of destruction, of epidemics, of internal revolutions, of possible disagreements as to peace objectives between the Allies themselves may develop.

The third point is that the American people, 132,000,000 of them, manifestly cannot undertake to provide a post-war United States W. P. A., unlimited, for all the ill-fed, ill-clad, and ill-housed millions of the rest of the world. There are more than 2,000,000,000 people in the world—World Almanac, 1943—and, outside of America, probably more than half of them would come within the category of the ill-fed, ill-clad, and ill-housed.

The fourth point is that the people of America cannot force the Atlantic Charter and its "four freedoms" down the throats of the other peoples of the world, even though we have the financial resources, the will, and the power to seriously attempt it. We do not definitely know what Joe Stalin, the dictator of Russia, thinks of the "four freedoms." He has never explicitly stated his views but we do know it is his intention, when the war is ended, to incorporate in the Union of Soviet Republics the so-called Baltic states of Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, together with part of Poland, without regard to the wishes of the peoples thereof. This is hardly in keeping with the spirit of the "four freedoms." However, we do know that the British do not want the "four freedoms" under the terms of the Atlantic Charter extended throughout India nor in many other

areas of the British Empire. Prime Minister Churchill made this very clear when he said in London on September 9, 1941, I quote:

The joint declaration does not qualify in any way the various statements of (British) policy which have been made from time to time about the developments of constitutional government in India, Burma, or other parts of the British Empire.

Also, when the Prime Minister stated to the Lord Mayor of London on November 10, 1942. I quote:

Let me, however, make this clear, in case there should be any mistake about it in any quarter. We mean to hold our own. I have not become the King's First Minister in order to preside over the liquidation of the British Empire.

The fifth point is, that not we alone, but we and our allies, including valorous, suffering China, will have to determine what the needs of the post-war world are, both from the standpoint of the victorious Allies, and of the defeated Axis peoples. It must be obvious to anyone thinking clearly on this subject that there may be wide differences of view to be reconciled, there may be a wide diversity of interests to be reconciled, and there undoubtedly will be a wide diversity of hatreds and prejudices which will have to be composed before we can have a post-war world of peace. That means, not some summary decisions on the part of these self-appointed, little-understanding planning groups in the United States, but compromise between the conflicting and bitter differences which existed among and within certain nations of the world before the beginning of the war.

The sixth point, what any enlightened American citizen already knows, is that only a safe, sound, free, solvent America can help the rest of the world or any part of it back to peace, sanity, and prosperity. No one ever saved a drowning man by jumping in and drowning with him.

The seventh point is that the greatest service we can render to the cause of democracy is to prove to the world, in the case of our own country, that democracy can stand up and operate effectively, and continue to exist under the stresses of war, as well as in the blessings of peace. If we fail to do this, then government of the people, for the people, and by the people will have failed in the world.

The eighth point is that any attempt on the part of the United States and the other Allied Powers to compel the American or the British form of government in the smaller countries would be imperialism. It is imperialism that our men and women on the fighting lines all over the world are now struggling to resist and destroy. Why emulate Hitler?

The ninth point is that we can aid other peoples in the world in securing an opportunity to adopt and adapt our American way, only insofar as it may be suited to their cultural and economic viewpoints and conditions. Beyond that we cannot go without departing from democracy and entering the field of imperialism. We must not forget that imperialism may be attempted or promoted through bribery by means of goods and

services, as well as by force of arms and aggression.

The tenth point is that the extravagant and irresponsible promises now being made by these self-appointed post-war planners, that the United States will undertake reformation of their economic and cultural conditions in the other countries of the world, to prescribe their methods of government, to regulate their wages and working conditions, their living conditions, their educational systems, and so forth, cannot possibly be carried out by the United States. Such irresponsible promises can and will result in leaving the other peoples of the world disappointed, angry, and with their faith in the integrity and stability of American promises and policies seriously impaired or destroyed. In which case we would emerge from this terrible war with only the enmity of the other nations of the world as our return for our vast sacrifices in human lives and happiness, and in financial treasure. This condition we must avoid.

The eleventh point is that Congress must move to set up some sort of supervision, perhaps by a Joint Congressional Council, or Commission, to investigate for and to advise the Congress as to its proper course of action in the final determination of this Nation's post-war policies.

The twelfth and final point is that the designs of these self-appointed post-war planners to continue, after the war, to spread billions of dollars' worth of American goods and services—American sweat, toil, and resources—among the other peoples of the world, would, if permitted, bankrupt America, enslave our own people, denude us of the necessities by which we support our own American cultural and living levels, and encourage the other peoples of the world to look to us as a paternalistic provider for all the improvident of the world, instead of exerting their own ingenuity and energy in providing for their own necessities.

America—a free, sound, solvent America—can help the other peoples of the world to help themselves. It is impossible logically to conceive that our responsibilities to the post-war world could possibly go beyond that point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] for 15 minutes.

#### ELIMINATION OF GOVERNMENT REGULATIONS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I suppose most Members of the House had an experience similar to my own during the Congressional recess, when we were privileged to sojourn at home for a period of 60 days and ascertain the temper and the general attitude of the people over the impositions of government. I am satisfied that the admonitions that came to you were similar to those that came to me. The people would say, "I hope when you return to Washington that you will get some action about a good many of these regulations, these rules and procedures that weigh down so heavily upon the American people." We have now

been in session a little while, and nothing has eventuated. I feel just a little disappointed over our inaction. I do not know what you, as Members of this House, are going to do, but I know what I am going to do. I am going to make some effort at it at least, and before I come to the conclusion I want to reach in the 15 minutes that are at my disposal, I think I ought to begin in a rather roundabout fashion and first remind you that the departments are already preparing their estimates for the Budget Bureau, for appropriations for the fiscal year 1945. There is no great magic about that. Every agency, every department of government is now working and has probably concluded its preliminary draft of estimates of what money they will need for the fiscal year 1945. They will then proceed to present these estimates to the Bureau of the Budget. Experts will be assigned by the Bureau, and they will go over these estimates very carefully.

When they are finally completed they will go to the White House and the President will be consulted, and when they are put into final form they will be ready for inclusion in the printed Budget of the United States, with some 1,100 pages that will be submitted to us in January. When the estimates are submitted, the appropriation bills will also be submitted therewith. Then hearings will begin in the Appropriations Committee so that the Congress may determine how much or how little shall be allocated to the different agencies of Government for the next fiscal year, which begins on July 1, 1944.

I have tried to summarize the general attitude of the Appropriations Committee, and the general attitude of the House as those measures are presented and it appears to be about like this: Our attitude generally with respect to appropriation bills is an attitude of protest. We find there that we have an instrumentality whereby we can discipline agencies of government when we cannot contrive it in any other way. If O. P. A., for instance, indulges in excesses and abuses and gets out capricious regulations of one kind or another, invades the sanctity of a man's business and seizes his books and papers, there are only two or three different approaches we can take. We could try to get the act repealed. You know and I know the difficulty of getting an act repealed when it has been established on the statute books and has been placed there pursuant to the demand of the people to do something about controlling and regulating prices. Nor is such an approach the answer as a general thing, the act itself cannot be repealed. So we voice and we articulate our protest when the appropriation bills come in. I certainly expressed my views early this year in the form of an amendment to strike \$35,000,000 from the O. P. A. estimate. It was approved by the House. I also expressed my protest early in the year by submitting an amendment to the House to require that every price director have 5 years of experience, which amendment passed this House and was later modified in the Sen-

ate, but which is receiving some attention from the O. P. A. at present.

So the thing I want to point out first of all is that we appear content to wait until January 1, when the appropriation bills come on the floor of the House, and then bespeak our protest and seek to exercise some kind of discipline over these agencies either by writing restrictions into the bills, or by amending them so that they will not have as much money to spend.

Well, it is all very interesting as an attitude, but why not some action now? It is all very interesting to protest in that fashion, but I sometimes wonder whether or not we get anywhere, whether or not there ought not be some far more basic approach. I say the people in the country have been rather hostile about a great many things. Every day divulges new experiences with the regulatory agencies of government. I have one that came to me this morning. Sometime in June, I happened to be in Minnesota and there I saw a chap who wrote me this week with reference to an experience with O. P. A. He had a refrigerator to sell and he inserted a classified ad in the newspaper. The next morning before he got out of bed his telephone began to ring and there were several people who wanted to buy that electric ice box. The price he quoted was \$125. A gentleman who used to live in Illinois called him and said, "Don't sell it until you see me. I will see you at the office when you get there." When the prospective vendor came to the office here was the prospective vendee. He said, "I will give you \$100 for the box." He said, "I will take \$125." So they finally made a deal at \$110. Now, he used the ice box for 66 whole days and it was quite satisfactory, and then the O. P. A. called up. They said, "Did you know you had violated the law?" He said, "In what respect?" They said, "You charged \$110 for a used electric ice box and the O. P. A. regulations require that you should charge only \$21."

So he consulted with the vendee. It may be that the buyer reported to O. P. A. He said, "I guess you will have to send that ice box back. I have got two of them but I will not sell it for \$21, so you send the box back and I will give you your check for \$110."

He said, "No, I propose to keep the box and you can give me the difference between \$110 and \$21."

So now he is being cited to the legal section of his State for having violated an O. P. A. regulation.

I have another that came in the mail this morning, in response to a little news article that went out with reference to an amendment I introduced the other day for judicial review of O. P. A. proceedings. This gentleman lives in Austin, Tex. He is in the business of making and selling fence posts. He said, "In Austin, Tex., the ceiling is 10 cents." He said, "Across the Arkansas River, just across the river, the ceiling is 16 cents. How do they expect me to stay in business?" That is a fair question.

That can be multiplied a thousand times to indicate the fractiousness of the

people at the present time with the regulations that are in effect. You know and I know when we came away from home they said to us, "Now, you go down to Washington and do something about it." I have been here since the 14th of September and we have done nothing about it yet.

So I propose, first of all, to make my very articulate protest, and then come to what I think is a conclusion and a remedy on the matter. Now, when you put together the growing controversy that has been in the air in recent months, and for that matter in recent years, what is it? It is a controversy between the lawmaking power of the Government and those to whom we delegate that power, who have engaged in the excessive exercise of the power. When all is said and done, that is the whole story. We are amenable to and responsible to the people, because they can discipline every last one of us at the polls, but you cannot discipline any Federal administrator at the polls, because he is an appointive officer and is not directly responsive to the electorate. The people look to us for aid in matters of this kind.

The people have only one place to go in order to secure some redress from their grievances and that is here, and we must do something about it unless we are going to confess our remissness to the country. They expect us to be alert to this whole business and they expect the Congress to retrieve its powers and to set up any delegation of power within a framework that is controllable, that is supervisable, and that is understandable to the people.

Mr. Speaker, that is just about the gist of this whole business that presents itself to us as a real problem.

I had an experience, as recorded in a letter very recently, from a very fine representative business in Peoria, when, without any search warrant, without any legal weapon of any kind, three agents of the Office of Price Administration walked into that office and seized the books, and let it appear that he was in violation of his sugar quota. A terrible thing, as a matter of fact, and it is only indicative of the fact that Congress is going to have to deal with this thing summarily and deal with it now.

I propose to file that letter with my friend, Raymond McKeough, the district director of the Office of Price Administration in that section and ask for some kind of corrective action.

But, Mr. Speaker, we cannot dispose of all these people who are exceeding their authority. It requires a sound, basic remedy. For instance, at the moment there have been developed facts before the Smith committee concerning rent control through the O. P. A. It appears from the interim report of that committee that O. P. A. had been encouraging people to file suits against landlords for the purpose of collecting damages and for the purpose of developing greater friction throughout the country. That is certainly a horrible state of affairs; it does not make for unity; it only develops and increases and aggravates friction in the country and it

is going to have to have some kind of action and must receive that attention soon.

What do we propose to do about it? How can the Congress meet that problem, a problem that grows out of the abuse of power that it has delegated to administrative agencies. Some suggest that we should not delegate those powers. I think, however, that the administrative management is here to stay. The delegation of some power to an administrative agency is absolutely necessary, in my judgment. Let us consider that for a moment. How could the Congress itself make freight rates? We have to give that power to the Interstate Commerce Commission.

How could we police all the fair-trade practices in industry? Since the Congress could not do it we delegate that power to the Federal Trade Commission.

Congress, of itself, cannot administer the Price Control Act and so there must be a price-control agency.

Our failure lies initially in not carefully delimiting and spelling out the delegated power which an administrative agency shall exercise; secondly, we are not staffed or equipped to follow through and make certain that the intent and spirit of any act is properly carried out; third, we have permitted the free exercise of judicial review to be limited and made ineffective. Thus, when abuses creep in and the rights of people are often ignored, we exercise the only remedy available to us other than the complete repeal of the act and that is to curtail funds and place restrictions on appropriations as a kind of discipline for such an agency. But when all is said and done, it is an unsatisfactory process and does not meet the problem.

What weapon is there; what are we going to do about it? We tried to do something about it once before. A good many of you will remember the efforts of the Congress in enacting the Walter-Logan bill. I am sure the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER], who is a member of the Judiciary Committee, recalls that committee reported a bill, which passed the House and went through the Senate and was vetoed by the President. And, as a result they set up this committee in the Department of Justice in order to explain this whole business of administrative law and make a report.

They did make a report. They sent me their documents. My desk was piled that high with them, and if I read them all it would take me 4 years, I suppose, to read all of the exhibits that have come to me.

Where are we going to find time to do that?

You and I know that the Walter-Logan bill had merit. It started out beautifully, and it wound up in the setting sun of a veto and nothing more has been done about it. We must stop kidding ourselves about it and really do something one way or the other, and I think it is necessary that we start right now.

Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time I have left?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 2 minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes, if it is agreeable to the gentleman from Michigan.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. If there is no objection, the gentleman is recognized for 5 additional minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. We all know how important this whole matter of delegated power and the careful supervision of that power by the Congress is going to be when the war is over.

One of the first things to be suggested will be to determine on a public-works program to meet the problem of demobilized veterans and demobilized defense workers, after free enterprise has done its utmost in providing full creative employment. Such a program means the appropriation of public funds and the creation of an administrative agency to administer such funds and the expression of such a program. Will there not be the same business over and over again of coming in here with joint resolutions from the Appropriations Committees delegating broad powers to agencies and giving them several billion dollars and saying, "Let her go, Gallagher." If we do that, we must be responsible for the fruits, and the bitter fruits, that may emanate from that kind of an approach.

What about surplus goods?

We are told that there will be \$50,000,000,000 of surplus war goods. What is going to happen? I assume there will be some kind of an agency to administer their disposition. Under what kind of power? The kind of power that we shall give such an agency here in Congress. So we are going to delegate. Within what limitations? And what rights of review will there be when controversies arise? Consider for a moment the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill on social security. There is one provision in that measure which intrigues me greatly. That is the one to federalize the whole program of unemployment compensation. We have a State-Federal system now. If that bill should prevail in its present form it would mean that there would be a completely federalized compensation system. And then what happens to the rights of review, to the adjudication of controversies that may arise where an employer may be on one side and an employee on the other?

What about all these defense plants that we have built—\$15,000,000,000 of your money and mine that is invested in plants that have been constructed by the Defense Plants Corporation? How will they be administered? I suppose some authority will be set up. Then there must be a delegation of power. What kind of delegation? How broad shall it be? And how far shall it go? And then there comes this whole problem of review all over again where controversies arise. So I am only pointing out to you that as we get into the post-war period this problem of administrative discretion, of administrative latitude is going to be infinitely greater than it is at the present time. Continued fric-

tion between the legislative and executive branch is neither wise nor healthy. Nor was it intended by the founders of this Republic. We must work out a technique which will make the administration of congressional enactments more efficient with a minimum of friction. Let me make this suggestion since my time is running out in order to get the thing crystallized. We had a situation in the city of Peoria recently where three Federal judges heard a case involving O. P. A. Judge Adair, who was once a Member of this House; Federal Circuit Judge Major, who was once a Member of this House; and Judge Briggie. It was a petition for a restraining order. The three-man court listened attentively to the petitioner's counsel and then respectfully and informally advised the petitioner that by a long series of acts Congress has gradually divested the regular Federal courts of jurisdiction and that they could offer no remedy. The O. P. A. Act clearly recited in section 204 that all jurisdiction on regulations and price schedules had been vested in a special court and that this three-man court hearing the case was powerless to afford relief. That is a rather tragic spectacle.

That was the language of Federal Judge Briggie not so very long ago, fairly reproaching the Congress for having divested the regular Federal courts of their jurisdiction.

What did we do in the O. P. A. Act? We set up a special emergency court. What a lure it was and how persuasive was the argument. I reread Mr. Ginsburg's memo to the Banking and Currency Committee in connection with this proposal. He said in effect, "We want a court of experts."

We want to relieve the Federal courts of congestion.

All right. He said:

We are going to make it possible for this court to operate in divisions to make justice accessible to all sections of the country, to every litigant, rich and poor alike.

That was the memorandum filed by O. P. A. with the Banking and Currency Committee when the O. P. A. Act was under consideration. We wrote into that emergency act this provision:

No Federal, circuit, or territorial court shall have jurisdiction over any controversy involving a price regulation or a price schedule.

That went through this body. I voted for it like other Members, although we did make an effort to secure the adoption of the proposal by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Wolcott] to retain this power in the regular Federal courts. We had the memo from O. P. A. expressing its faith in the emergency court which it proposed. But it has not worked, and people with grievances have a difficult time securing redress of such grievances. We can still retrieve that mistake and make a vigorous effort to restore judicial review to the regular Federal courts so that in truth and in fact, any citizens who is aggrieved by the actions of an administrative agency of Government will have his day in court. Is that asking too much? Is that not the proper

and basic way to meet the excesses of administrative agencies of Government?

Recently I introduced a bill to meet this problem. It is in the nature of an amendment to the O. P. A. Act to restore jurisdiction to Federal courts to review all actions, regulations and schedules of O. P. A. It is now pending before the Committee on Banking and Currency. I am not advised as to whether a hearing will be held or not. Moreover, time is of the essence. Why not get action on this matter without delay.

If no hearing will be held, there is another method open.

I do know there is a bill pending that was introduced by my friend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Wolcott], H. R. 2705. It was introduced May 13, 1943. This bill contains a provision reading like this:

Notwithstanding the provisions of any law, order, directive, regulation, finding, or determination the right of any person to a judicial review of grievances resulting from the promulgation of any order, directive, regulation, finding, or determination under this act shall not be denied.

That is the section of the Wolcott bill in which I am interested. How can we get action on it? If we cannot get a hearing from the Committee on Banking and Currency there is still one other way. I am going to file a discharge petition on Mr. Wolcott's bill, H. R. 2705, yet this afternoon and if you want to help restore judicial review to the regular Federal courts of the country and give the people their day in court in the third branch of Government all I can ask is that you march up to the Clerk's desk at the proper time and affix your signature to the petition. If we discharge the committee it can come to the floor for action. Whenever we deny to the people, an opportunity to go into court for relief from the encroachments of government agencies, we abridge the last best hope of this Nation. Adequate judicial review is after all the answer to the controversy between the Congress and the bureaus.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER] is recognized for 20 minutes.

GEN. GEORGE C. MARSHALL

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I was delayed in reaching the House today. I should like to have heard the barrage that was laid down regarding the subject I am to speak on.

Mr. Speaker, about 2 weeks ago an authoritative Army publication contained an editorial alleging that powerful political forces had laid careful plans to take over the War Department following the appointment of Gen. George C. Marshall, Chief of Staff, to the post of global commander in chief.

During the following days many newspapers discussed this alleged plot and it was brought out in some detail on the floor of this House by the gentlewoman from Illinois [Miss SUMNER]. It was a

matter of common discussion in the Capital.

I point out these facts for the purpose of showing that it had been well aired before I came into the picture last Thursday.

I take the floor today in connection with this matter because I cannot permit administration apologists to put words in my mouth and to misrepresent my position.

At the outset, permit me to make perfectly clear that:

First. I have never directed any criticism, nor linked with any plot, the reportedly proposed appointment of General Marshall as global chief of staff. I have understood for sometime that General Marshall has been the accepted choice of the leaders of the United Nations for the post of supreme commander when the final blow is to be struck against the Axis Powers.

Second. I have made no criticism of the Commander in Chief of our Army in connection with this proposed promotion of General Marshall. In fact, I said in my remarks on Thursday:

I prefer to think his promotion is a fine recognition of General Marshall's ability.

Now, after the matter had been thoroughly discussed by newspaper and radio commentators and editorial writers, I took the position that where there is smoke there is usually fire, and, with another Member of Congress, who is seated on the floor of the House here today, and whose identity will be made known at the proper time, conferred with a high official of the War Department, whose name and rank must obviously be held in confidence.

I was furnished substantially the same information as was contained in an article written by William K. Hutchinson, for the International News Service, which I caused to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD on page A-4001.

Now let us get right down to the essence of this thing. The information contained in this story has never been denied by anyone in high authority. A flat denial would be simple and easy if there is no basis for the report. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE] and the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] took the floor yesterday and attempted to place me on the defensive. The usual tactics of those in this administration is to attempt to question the patriotism of anyone who criticizes or reveals any questionable activities of the New Deal politicians.

It was obvious that these two gentlemen had but little information regarding the subject. If anybody thinks that by throwing out a smoke screen or attacking me personally I can be scared, somebody had better guess again. As I said yesterday, any time I am convinced politics are being played in connection with the war effort, jeopardizing the lives of millions of American boys, I intend to tell the Nation about it regardless of what may happen to me politically. And I permit no man to question my patriotism.

Let it be thoroughly understood, I do not want New Deal politicians running the War Department. There are too many capable men to carry on General Marshall's program if he is appointed supreme commander of the United Nations, without turning the job over to a political general, or giving control of the War Department to politicians. The Nation—the fathers and mothers, the brothers and sisters, the wives and children of the men and women in the armed services—want this war won as quickly as possible, with minimum loss of life and casualties, and any political manipulation of the conduct of the war would be a betrayal of our Nation, and might lose the war for us.

I feel that if by any word or deed I can prevent those in the cabal mentioned in the Hutchinson article from taking over the War Department and building it into a political machine, I will have rendered our armed forces and the Nation a service. Unless there are definite, complete denials that such a plot exists, I shall insist upon keeping this Congress and the people of the United States informed of any facts I can secure.

#### SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROLPH] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time today to commend two soldiers who, in my opinion, have made outstanding records in the war effort. Both of them have been stationed in my district in San Francisco and both have contributed greatly to the defense of our country. I refer to Lt. Gen. John L. De Witt and to Maj. Gen. Frederick Gilbreath.

The House will remember after Pearl Harbor the delegations from California, Oregon, and Washington urged that the Japanese in all three States be evacuated. You will further recall that due to the resolutions passed by our group the President issued his directive whereby approximately 120,000 Japanese were evacuated from three Pacific Coast States. When that directive was issued, I think I reflect the sentiment of practically every layman in the country when I say we thought it was going to be an extremely difficult job. I want to say here and now that I was absolutely amazed and agreeably surprised that those Japanese were evacuated from the three Pacific Coast States without any untoward incident of any kind, without any confusion, and without any disturbance to our economy. Great credit is due General De Witt for the splendid way in which he handled the problem. As the Representative from the Fourth California Congressional District, I want my countrymen everywhere to know how much the people in my district appreciate General De Witt's excellent work.

During the recent recess I had the privilege of visiting the different supply depots that go to make up the San Francisco port of embarkation. With General Gilbreath I inspected the different depots and it was remarkable the way embarkation in the San Francisco port has been

carried on. I visited the docks where the ships are loaded. I went to the warehouses where the goods are accumulated and stored. I went to the yards where the automobiles, trucks, jeeps, and different motor vehicles are assembled and where they are prepared for embarkation. It was particularly impressive how smoothly and efficiently every detail was worked out. No confusion anywhere; no disorder. Everything so spick and span, shipshape. As a matter of fact, I do not believe that there are many mercantile establishments of long standing in the United States better organized and better operated than are the depots comprising San Francisco's port of embarkation.

It may interest my fellow colleagues to know that San Francisco for many months was the leading port of embarkation in the United States. With the step-up in the tempo in the Pacific war area it may easily be the most important port of embarkation in months ahead.

On yesterday my colleague from San Francisco, Representative RICHARD J. WELCH, introduced in the RECORD an editorial from the San Francisco Examiner of September 24, 1943. The article is entitled "War Efficiency at Coast Ports" and tells of the service being rendered by General Gilbreath. It appears on page A4011 of the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to have the opportunity of congratulating two great Americans, Lieutenant General De Witt and Major General Gilbreath.

#### PRICE CONTROL NECESSARY—ATTACKS HAVE WEAKENED LAW—LATEST PROPOSAL WILL DESTROY THE LAW AND CAUSE RUINOUS INFLATION

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is one of the ablest men in this House. He is a very sincere Member and he is a very effective Member. He made a statement awhile ago that I do not think should go unchallenged. I inferred from his statement that the House must have been fooled or misled—I hope he did not mean it that way—in the passage of the Price Control Act in that a provision was written into the law that the Federal courts in the country could not have anything to do with restraining its operation and enforcement.

As a member of the committee that assisted in the writing of that bill may I say that it was well known why that provision was put in there. There was no secret about it. Everyone knew it. The provision was put in there for a good purpose, a purpose without which the price-control law would not be worth anything at all. If you were to pass a Price Control Act, and then allow any Federal judge in the United States to restrain price control, you would always have an injunction against price control. You would not have price control

at all. You know, we have Federal judges of different faiths and beliefs and they have their hates and their prejudices. If we permitted any Federal judge to grant an injunction against price control you would always have an injunction against price control. So you would have no price control at all.

The answer is, If you really believe in price control you should have a law that is very drastic, something that we would not stand for in peace at all. I would not stand for this law in time of peace willingly and you would not either. It was a question of adopting drastic, radical, and an arbitrary means of preventing ruinous inflation in this country, that is all. So if you want to destroy price control and not have any price control at all, the best step that you can possibly take is to sign Mr. DIRKSEN's petition and bring out the bill, then pass it and allow any Federal judge in this Nation to restrain the operation of that law. In that event you will have no law at all.

So if you believe in a ruinous, runaway inflation, let the prices go to the sky, and have no control over them, that kind of a law is the kind of law you should pass.

The last Congress was an inflationary Congress. We not only crippled O. P. A. by reducing the appropriations to where they could not do an effective job but we also reduced and eliminated an appropriation for O. W. I., the only agency that was selling the people of this country on the reason why inflation should be prevented. Yet, we come here with this body blow. Why, it is equal to the repeal of the O. P. A. law. If you are going to pass a bill like that, you might just as well face the issues squarely and say, "I do not believe in price control or rent control, I want to repeal the law absolutely." I do not think the people of this country are ready for that.

I know the O. P. A. has done some awfully foolish things, a lot of things I do not approve of at all, and things that I condemn; but at the same time the over-all picture is that we must have price control and rent control or we shall wipe out entirely and destroy the middle class of the people in this country who are dependent upon wages and salaries and fixed incomes for support.

In some places in the world today they are paying a dollar and a quarter for a loaf of bread. In Russia and China they are paying \$400 and \$500 for a suit of clothes, just a common ordinary suit of clothes such as we are wearing now. They are paying \$7.50 for half a pint of milk. That is happening over there now. It can happen here. Do you want it to happen here? Do you want ruinous inflation? Do you want to pay a wheelbarrow load of printing press money for a loaf of bread? If you do, repeal the O. P. A. law. If you repeal the price control and rent control, you will have that type of ruinous inflation.

Regardless of the mistakes that have been made price control generally has been worth a lot to this country. It has absolutely saved the country. Did you know that the basic materials that go to

make up this big war machine of ours, copper, brass, steel, and other metals, have not increased in price 1 penny in 3 years? Why? Because the O. P. A. has held down the price, that is why.

Did you know that we have been saved tens of billions of dollars in the cost of the war because the prices of the things we are having to buy in this war have been fixed, and it was impossible for them to be raised? Certainly that is true.

I could name a lot of things whose prices have not increased one penny, by reason of O. P. A. So all in all, regardless of the irritations and the annoyance that we have had in connection with it, it is a thousand times better than having runaway or ruinous inflation.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I must say I am quite astonished by the gentleman's argument.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman is no more astonished than I am astonished by the gentleman, because he has always been against inflation, I thought.

Mr. DIRKSEN. What the gentleman's argument amounts to is that he does not want the people to have access to the regular Federal courts for redress of their grievances. That is the whole argument.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman knows that if you allowed any court in this Nation to restrain the operation of this law you would not have any law, because we have judges who have their hates and dislikes and prejudices just as do Members of Congress. It would be just like leaving it to any one Member of this House, and the gentleman knows what that would amount to.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WRIGHT. In spite of the mistakes that have been made, does not the gentleman believe that the picture in the control of inflation is much better than it was in the last war?

Mr. PATMAN. It is a lot better.

Although the regular Federal courts do not have the jurisdiction the gentleman from Illinois wants them to have those who are charged with violating the O. P. A. Act are protected in their rights by a court set up for that purpose and appeals allowed even to the Supreme Court of the United States.

Section 203, subsections (c) and (d) of the Price-Control Act setting up the court to deal with O. P. A. cases provides:

(c) There is hereby created a court of the United States to be known as the Emergency Court of Appeals, which shall consist of three or more judges to be designated by the Chief Justice of the United States

from judges of the United States district courts and circuit courts of appeals. The Chief Justice of the United States shall designate one of such judges as chief judge of the Emergency Court of Appeals, and may, from time to time, designate additional judges for such court and revoke previous designations. The chief judge may, from time to time, divide the court into divisions of three or more members, and any such division may render judgment as the judgment of the court. The court shall have the powers of a district court with respect to the jurisdiction conferred on it by this act; except that the court shall not have power to issue any temporary restraining order or interlocutory decree staying or restraining, in whole or in part, the effectiveness of any regulation or order issued under section 2 or any price schedule effective in accordance with the provisions of section 206. The court shall exercise its powers and prescribe rules governing its procedure in such manner as to expedite the determination of cases of which it has jurisdiction under this act. The court may fix and establish a table of costs and fees to be approved by the Supreme Court of the United States, but the costs and fees so fixed shall not exceed with respect to any item the costs and fees charged in the Supreme Court of the United States. The court shall have a seal, hold sessions at such places as it may specify, and appoint a clerk and such other employees as it deems necessary or proper.

(d) Within 30 days after entry of a judgment or order, interlocutory or final, by the Emergency Court of Appeals, a petition for a writ of certiorari may be filed in the Supreme Court of the United States, and thereupon the judgment or order shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court in the same manner as a judgment of a circuit court of appeals as provided in section 240 of the Judicial Code, as amended (U. S. C., 1934 ed., title 28, sec. 347). The Supreme Court shall advance on the docket and expedite the disposition of all causes filed therein pursuant to this subsection. The Emergency Court of Appeals, and the Supreme Court upon review of judgments and orders of the Emergency Court of Appeals, shall have exclusive jurisdiction to determine the validity of any regulation or order issued under section 2, of any price schedule effective in accordance with the provisions of section 206, and of any provision of any such regulation, order, or price schedule. Except as provided in this section, no court, Federal, State, or Territorial, shall have jurisdiction or power to consider the validity of any such regulation, order, or price schedule, or to stay, restrain, enjoin, or set aside, in whole or in part, any provision of this act authorizing the issuance of such regulations or orders, or making effective any such price schedule, or any provision of any such regulation, order, or price schedule, or to restrain or enjoin the enforcement of any such provision.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCormack] be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article from the Boston Post.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address by Commissioner

Flemming, of the Civil Service Commission.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Thursday, September 30, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### COMMITTEE HEARINGS

##### COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

The Committee on Immigration and Naturalization will hold public hearings at 10:30 a. m. on Wednesday, October 6, 1943, on H. R. 2701 and private bills.

##### COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Tuesday, October 12, 1943, at 10 o'clock a. m.

At that time consideration will be given to the following bills:

H. R. 3257. A bill to amend subtitle—insurance of title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to authorize suspension of the statute of limitations in certain cases, and for other purposes.

The purposes of the bill is to affirm and clarify the authority of the W. S. A. to agree to a waiver of the statute of limitations in connection with claims arising from insurance agreements in case of missing vessels, in order to provide for prompt settlement of both marine risks and war risks involved.

H. R. 3258. A bill to prevent double recovery on claims under section 1 (a) of Public Law 17, Seventy-eighth Congress, relating to seamen employed by the United States through the War Shipping Administration.

The purpose of the bill is to limit the possibility of double or overlapping recovery on account of death or injury of seamen employed as employees of the United States by the W. S. A. The possibility of such overlapping recovery arises in cases of seamen who are entitled to sue under the law of the United States in case of death or injury and may also be entitled to sue under foreign law on account of the same casualty.

H. R. 3259. A bill to clarify the application of section 1 (b) of Public Law 17, Seventy-eighth Congress, to certain services performed by seamen as employees of the United States through the War Shipping Administration.

The purpose of the bill is to exclude from consideration for the purposes of old-age and survivors insurance benefits, services of seamen employed as employees of the United States by the U. S. A. on foreign-flag vessels or contracted for and performed wholly outside the United States, so that the coverage for such benefits for seamen employees of the W. S. A. shall be in line with the coverage in case of similar services by seamen employed by private shipping operators.

H. R. 3260. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to provide for requisition or purchase of vessels owned by subsidiaries of American corporations.

The purpose of the bill is to authorize the requisition or purchase under the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, of vessels owned by American concerns through foreign subsidiaries but which are not owned by United States citizens within the terms of the Merchant Marine Act and which are not idle foreign vessels within the terms of the act of June 6, 1941—Public, 101, Seventy-seventh Congress.

H. R. 3261. A bill to amend the act of April 29, 1943, to authorize the return to private ownership of Great Lakes vessels and vessels of 1,000 gross tons or less, and for other purposes.

The purpose of the bill is, by amending Public Law 44, Seventy-eighth Congress, to authorize the return of Great Lakes vessels and vessels of 1,000 gross tons or less which are owned by the United States under the procedure of Public Law 44 for the return to private ownership of vessels to which the United States has title which are no longer needed in the war effort.

H. R. 3262. A bill to amend section 2 (b) of Public Law 17, Seventy-eighth Congress, relating to functions of the War Shipping Administration, and for other purposes.

The purpose of the bill is to expressly authorize the waiver of recovery of seamen's insurance payments by the W. S. A. particularly in cases where insurance has been paid to beneficiaries on the assumption that the missing seamen were dead, but later are found to be alive. The bill follows a similar provision with respect to recovery of benefits paid by the Veterans' Administration.

House Joint Resolution 158. A bill to establish a Board of Visitors for the United States Merchant Marine Academy.

The purpose of the resolution is to provide for a Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy similar to that provided for the United States Coast Guard Academy.

House Joint Resolution 161. A bill to provide cash awards to personnel of the Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration for useful suggestions to improve administration of their activities.

The purpose of the resolution is to authorize the Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration to pay cash awards for suggestions received from employees to increase efficiency or improve the functioning of the agencies.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

763. A letter from the Director, Selective Service System, transmitting adjusted schedules regarding number of deferred employees credited to several agencies; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

764. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed provision pertaining to an appropriation for the Federal Security Agency for the fiscal year 1944 (H. Doc. No. 305); to the

Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

765. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the Federal Security Agency for the fiscal year 1944, amounting to \$11,306,200 (H. Doc. No. 306); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

766. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the Department of Commerce for the fiscal year 1944, amounting to \$4,189,000 (H. Doc. No. 307); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

767. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Southwestern Power Administration of the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year 1944, in the amount of \$135,000 (H. Doc. No. 308); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

768. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a deficiency estimate of appropriation for the legislative establishment, House of Representatives, fiscal year 1943, \$40,000, and supplemental estimates of appropriations for the legislative establishment, United States Senate and House of Representatives, fiscal year 1944, in the amount of \$19,359, in all, \$59,359 (H. Doc. No. 309); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SADOWSKI:

H. R. 3343. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942, as amended, so as to liberalize family allowances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KUNKEL:

H. R. 3344. A bill to extend the time for securing allowance of credit against Federal unemployment taxes for the calendar years 1941 and 1942; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'CONNOR:

H. R. 3345. A bill to authorize the leasing of Indian lands for business and other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 3346. A bill to authorize the leasing of the segregated coal and asphalt deposits of the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations in Oklahoma; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 3347. A bill to authorize the execution of leases in behalf of Indians serving in the armed forces of the United States; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 3348. A bill to enable soldiers to vote by proxy; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. CAMP:

H. R. 3349. A bill relating to the taxation of the grantor of certain discretionary trusts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'CONNOR:

H. J. Res. 166. Joint resolution to provide for the disposition of the proceeds to accrue as a result of the interlocutory judgment of the Court of Claims in the suit brought against the United States by the Menominee Tribe of Indians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. FURLONG:

H. J. Res. 167. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right to vote to citizens 18 years of age or older; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BULWINKLE:

H. Res. 307. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, as a whole or by subcommittee, to study and investigate matters related to air commerce and air navigation; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 308. Resolution to provide for the payment of expenses of conducting the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 307; to the Committee on Accounts.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

H. R. 3350. A bill for the relief of Miss Olga Wahlstrom; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SHAFER:

H. R. 3351. A bill for the relief of Howard L. Pemberton; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SADOWSKI:

H. R. 3352. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Edward Gray, Sr., Edward Gray, Jr., Bertha Mae Gray, Bertha Patom, and Lindsay Gardner, all of the city of Hamtramck, Wayne County, Mich.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SPRINGER:

H. R. 3353. A bill for the relief of Frank D. Howells, treasurer of the city of Richmond, Ind.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WIGGLESWORTH:

H. R. 3354. A bill for the relief of Mabel R. Woodfall; to the Committee on Claims.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2564. By Mr. ANDREWS: Petition containing the names of 142 residents of Niagara County, N. Y., favoring the favorable consideration of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2565. By Mr. BRYSON: Petition of Elsie Wheeler and 180 citizens of Waverly, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2566. Also, petition of 59 citizens of Reisterstown, Md., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2567. Also, petition of Rev. Earl G. Lee and 28 members of the Church of the Nazarene, Kingston, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2568. Also, petition of 29 members of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Duluth, Minn., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the

United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2569. Also, petition of Mrs. W. I. Randle and 25 citizens of Cockeysville, Md., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2570. Also, petition of the Westminster Mexican Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Westminster, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2571. Also, petition of Rev. Robert B. Hamilton and 70 citizens of Knoxville, Tenn., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2572. Also, petition of George W. Stith and 120 citizens of Atterberry, Ill., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2573. Also, petition of Mrs. Charles W. Parsons and 50 citizens of White Plains, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2574. Also, petition of Mrs. Clara M. Evans and 57 citizens of West Milton, Ohio, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2575. Also, petition of 60 members of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Wilkinsburg, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2576. Also, petition of K. H. Ladman and 169 citizens of Esther, Mo., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2577. By Mr. CANNON of Missouri: Petition of Mrs. R. M. Dixon, of Winfield, Mo., and 19 citizens of Lincoln County, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufac-

ture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2578. Also, petition of Mrs. C. D. Howard and 19 citizens of Winfield, Mo., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2579. Also, petition of Mrs. A. C. Walters and 25 citizens of Troy, Mo., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2580. Also, petition of Mrs. John Boborovsky and 25 citizens of Pacific, Mo., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2581. Also, petition of Gertrude Sawtelle and 21 citizens of St. Louis, Mo., urging passage of House Resolution No. 117, to aid the starving children of occupied Europe; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2582. By Mr. ROHRBOUGH: Petition of Mrs. R. M. Reynolds and 18 other citizens of Richwood, W. Va., requesting enactment of House Resolution 2082, to remove one of the chief causes of absenteeism, to conserve shipping space, and to prevent the waste of untold amounts of money and huge quantities of food, coal, iron, rubber, and gasoline, by stopping the manufacture and sale of alcoholic beverages for the duration of the war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2583. By Mr. GWYNNE: Petition of Mrs. W. Walter Wilson, of Traer, and other residents of Tama County, Iowa, supporting House bill 2082, known as the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2584. Also, petition of Chloe Y. Frisbie, president of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, and other residents of Eldora, Iowa, urging enactment of House bill 2082, known as the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2585. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Petition of the Racine Association of Commerce, Racine, Wis., with reference to House bill 3183; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2586. By Mr. BURGIN: Petition of the Forester Beverage Co., signed by a number of citizens of Wilkes County, N. C., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2587. By Mr. TALLE: Petition of Alice J. Burnside and other citizens of Oelwein, Iowa, urging the passage of House bill 2082 in order to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed the production of materials necessary for winning the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2588. By Mr. LEFEVRE: Petition of Rainbow Lodge, of Greenville, N. Y., protesting against the consideration of any and all prohibition measures by Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2589. By Mr. HAYS: Petition of Mr. and Mrs. J. B. Hasley and others of Little Rock, Ark., urging the passage of House bill 2082, by Mr. EYSON, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed the production of

materials necessary for wining the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2590. By Mr. COCHRAN (on behalf of himself and his colleagues from Missouri, Mr. FLOESER and Mr. MILLER): Petitions signed by sundry citizens of St. Louis and addressed to the Congress of the United States, containing 54,607 names, urging a reduction in the cost of living, and asking for a roll-back of prices to September 15, 1942, as outlined in the following measures: (1) Subsidies on a differential basis to cover the special burdens of small business and high-cost producers; (2) grade labeling; (3) dollars-and-cents ceilings on all cost-of-living items at their September 15, 1942, level; (4) continued rent control; (5) a strong Office of Price Administration—staffed with loyal supporters of price control—given adequate funds for enforcement—with full power to enforce ceilings and to compel delivery of supplies by the food processors; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

## SENATE

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 29, 1943

(Legislative day of Wednesday, September 15, 1943)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Merciful Father, whose faithfulness is constant with all our fickleness, whose forgiveness outlasts all our transgressions against Thy holy love, we bemoan the delusions which have led us to mistake shadows for substance; we confess that by the opiate of our own achieving we were lulled into cushioned optimism. Now with jarred and jolted minds we see the whole circle of the world grown somber and terrible with the fires of battle and the smoke of a judgment which envelopes us all. We behold in the torture and rubble and dust of this conflict Thy righteous sentence on our godless lives. We but reap the ghastly and costly harvest of our careless years.

Help us in this hour which reveals our desperate state, with contrition for past mistakes, with their tragic consequences; renouncing all cynicism, all disbelief in the innate splendor of humanity, that we may be empowered to fill with satisfaction to ourselves and benefit to the world the solemn role to which we have been deputized by destiny. We ask it in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Tuesday, September 28, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

### CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	Pepper
Andrews	Guffey	Radcliffe
Austin	Gurney	Reed
Bailey	Hatch	Revercomb
Ball	Hawkes	Reynolds
Barbour	Hayden	Robertson
Barkley	Hill	Russell
Brewster	Holman	Scruggs
Bridges	Johnson, Calif.	Shipstead
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Buck	Kilgore	Taft
Bushfield	Langer	Thomas, Idaho
Butler	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Capper	McClellan	Tobey
Caraway	McFarland	Tunnell
Chavez	McKellar	Tydings
Clark, Idaho	McNary	Vandenberg
Clark, Mo.	Maloney	Van Nuys
Connally	Maybank	Wagner
Danaher	Mead	Wallgren
Davis	Millikin	Walsh
Downey	Moore	Wheeler
Eastland	Murdoch	Wherry
Ellender	Murray	White
Ferguson	Nye	Wiley
George	O'Daniel	Willis
Gerry	O'Mahoney	Wilson
Gillette	Overton	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] is absent on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO] are detained on important public business.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LONGE] is necessarily absent as a member of a special committee of the Senate investigating matters pertaining to the conduct of the war.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] is necessarily absent.

The senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] has been confined to a Madison hospital since September 13.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-six Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

### NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF LUTHER M. SWYGERT TO BE DISTRICT JUDGE, NORTHERN DISTRICT OF INDIANA

Mr. McCARRAN. M. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing of the committee will be held on the morning of October 7, 1943, at 10:30 a. m., in the Senate Judiciary Committee room, upon the nomination of Luther M. Swygert, of Indiana, to be United States district judge for the northern district of Indiana. At that time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make representations to the committee.

### ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on September 28, 1943, that committee presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 135. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of the General State Authority of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania;

S. 159. An act for the relief of the United States Parcel Post Building Co., of Cleveland, Ohio;

S. 332. An act for the relief of Velma Pikkarainen;

S. 426. An act for the relief of Maj. George E. Golding;

S. 462. An act for the relief of Primo Giordanengo and Angie Giordanengo;

S. 626. An act for the relief of Angeline Arbuckle;

S. 652. An act for the relief of Joseph A. Lassiter;

S. 787. An act for the relief of Samuel Jacobs and Harry Jacobs;

S. 789. An act to provide for the mailing of annual notices to owners of tax-exempt properties in the District of Columbia;

S. 824. An act for the relief of Dr. J. W. Goin;

S. 915. An act for the relief of Robert Kish Lee and Elizabeth Kish;

S. 929. An act for the relief of Dr. Douglas E. Lawson;

S. 1223. An act to fix the compensation of the recorder of deeds of the District of Columbia and the Superintendent of the National Training Schools for Girls; and

S. 1224. An act to designate the Public Library of the District of Columbia a public depository for governmental publications.

### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also announced that on September 28, 1943, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 462. An act for the relief of Primo Giordanengo and Angie Giordanengo;

S. 626. An act for the relief of Angeline Arbuckle;

S. 652. An act for the relief of Joseph A. Lassiter;

S. 915. An act for the relief of Robert Kish Lee and Elizabeth Kish; and

S. 1224. An act to designate the Public Library of the District of Columbia a public depository for governmental publications.

### AUDIT OF TRANSACTIONS OF FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE CORPORATION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of an audit made by the General Accounting Office of financial transactions of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation for the period from July 1, 1939, to June 30, 1940, which with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. BAILEY, from the Committee on Commerce:

H. R. 2649. A bill to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Minnesota to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Mississippi River at or near the village of Brooklyn Center, Minn., approved April 20, 1942; without amendment (Rept. No. 419).